

| GEROVOKAYA

SH EUROPE STRAIT

WORLDWIDE HISTORY OF THE SECOND WORLD

Hitler's Europe

against the USSR

Unknown history of World War II

Moscow "YAUZA-PRESS" 2009

UDC 94 BBK 63.3(0) and,

Sh 96

Sh 96

Design by the artist /1. Volkova

Shumeiko I. N.

Hitler's Europe against the USSR Unknown history of World War II / Igor Shumeiko. - M. : Yauza-press, 2009. - 384 p. — (Second World War: Behind the Scenes of the Disaster).

15VM 978-5-9955-0094-0

In the new “cold war” unleashed by the West against Russia, history is becoming the main weapon – reviewing the results of the Second World War, the revisionists are increasingly aggressively demanding that we “begive” for the Soviet past: they want to make us “pay and repent.” But we have nothing to repent of and nothing to pay for. On the contrary, we ourselves are in a position to present Europe with a large bill.

Because long before 1968, when Soviet tanks entered Czechoslovakia, Czech Wehrmacht tanks were killing our grandfathers near Moscow and Stalingrad. Because the Latvian riflemen unleashed the genocide of the Russian people two decades earlier than the Red Army "Sovietized" the Baltic states. Because twenty years before Katyn, the Poles killed tens of thousands of captured Red Army soldiers in their concentration camps. Because during the years of the Second World War in Europe “occupied” (or rather, united) by Hitler, there were far fewer Resistance fighters than SS volunteers, not to mention those tens of millions that voluntarily worked for the military industry of the Reich.

Read about all this, about the most shameful and dirty secrets of the “united Europe” in the sensational book by Igor Shumeiko.

UDC 94 BBK 63.3(0)

© Shumeiko I. N., 2009

15VM 978-5-9955-0094-0 © Yauza-press LLC, 2009

Foreword

I confess to the reader that the first pages of the book aroused a certain distrust. I, a general and a doctor of historical sciences, had a chance to reread a lot about the past world war. Here are multi-volume histories of the war, and monographic studies, both by our and foreign authors, and long documents of that era, and memoirs of military leaders, politicians,

diplomats, etc., etc. Yes, and my own Ph.D. thesis is also about it, albeit with a military-technical bias.

And then suddenly - either a lengthy pamphlet, or an essay, or a large feuilleton. In general, it is absolutely not a military-literary genre. But little by little, a desire to read further arose, and then, having "swallowed" the book, I felt disappointed that the last page had been read.

How did the author manage to arouse genuine interest in events and facts that seemed to have been traveled many times over and comprehensively described in tons of historical literature? The essence is in a new perspective of their reading, in a new assessment of their significance for the course and outcome of the war. The author, penetrating inside the event, pulls out its essence, hidden under historical dust, and presents the reader: here, they say, look, comprehend.

Thus, he becomes an accuser of Czechoslovakia, which all historians and the public of the world considered a victim, a kind of defenseless lamb given as a result of the Munich Agreement to be torn to pieces by a German predator. But when you compare the ratio of the military forces of Germany and Czechoslovakia, you think about the military-industrial potential

5

the last, about the surprisingly favorable character of the terrain for defense, you clearly understand that Benes and his government actually voluntarily capitulated to Hitler. And then I. Shumeiko adds a quote from W. Churchill, which completes the picture: "And besides, the Skoda factories, the second most important arsenal in Europe, which since August 38 th to September 39th produced as much production as all English factories during the same period.

And this huge "European workshop" (Skoda and ěKD factories) worked properly for the Wehrmacht without a single strike or sabotage until the Second World War and throughout the war. That is, the Czechs, in fact, fought against the USSR, on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Victory they declared themselves a country occupied by the Soviet Union, and they are destroying the symbols of the liberation of Prague by our troops.

The same is true for the Balts, Poles and other "victims" of the Soviet "occupation". Igor Shumeiko, through a deep analysis of "little things" and particulars, leads the reader to an understanding of rather large problems, shows the true face of the active players of the Second World War ... And connects those already distant events with the present, convincingly showing the transformation of views, conclusions and assessments in - events. The prophetic phrase of I.V. Stalin, which he said back in 1945: "In this war we lost the best. And this will certainly have an impact", receives development from the author and acquires a modern sound. Especially against the background of the current continuous power-elite mediocrity, betrayal and hatred for the USSR and Russia.

The author, introducing little-known documents into circulation, exposes not only the current anti-elite, but also those "not the best" who came to the crucible of power after Stalin and tried to denigrate him, and the Victory, and the people. For example, for the first time I saw Stalin's new post-war program, which was supposed to change the essence of our state and society. Here are her outlines:

- detente of international tension;
- publicity;
- limited democracy, primarily in the party;
- improving the life of the population;
- decentralization of the economy.

6

Here, too, is the preparation for the removal of the party nomenklatura layer from interfering in all spheres of society, the promotion of initiative and creativity, and the enhancement of the role of theoretical knowledge ("Without theory, we will perish").

The connection between the events of the last world war in the Balkans and the current situation in the former Yugoslavia is very interesting. Let's think about the words: "100% coincidence of sympathies and antipathies of "Europe united (by Hitler)" in 1941-1944 and "Europe united (by Clinton)" in 1992-1999... Croats and Muslims were condemned a dozen field commanders, the Serbs have the whole state." Having become acquainted with how the pre-war and military situation in the Balkans developed, you come to the following conclusion: the war that was waged against the Serbs in 1941-1944 continued in the 1990s in a slightly changed configuration of the opposing forces. Hitler's allies — Croats, Albanians, Bosnians — have become faithful allies of NATO, and the alliance itself is nothing but an updated model of a large Wehrmacht aimed at the Slavic world and Russia.

Igor Shumeiko ends his work with an amazing generalizing conclusion: "Today, the version of the Great War (outside of any pacts and time frames. — L.I.) seems to return some participants "to the front line", reminding them which side they were on.

In general, the reader will find in this book a lot of new and interesting things.

Colonel General L.G. IVASHOV, President of the Academy of Geopolitical Problems

From the author

FROM THE "DIPLOMATIC PREFACE" TO THE SECOND EDITION "THE SECOND WORLD. REBOOT,". JUNE, 2007

Among what adds up to the "resonance caused by the book", the following seemed to me very indicative. In Pozner's "Vremeny" in April 2007, there was a long conversation about the Second World War and its consequences. Mark Rozovsky, figuratively speaking, prescribed a regime of "strict repentance" for Russia. And, of course, under the control of experienced doctors: the United States and world democracy... A couple more characters, including Dr. Posner, contritely agreed with the diagnosis. And quite successfully (judging by the reaction of the audience) objecting to them, the editor of Literaturnaya Gazeta, Yuri Polyakov, cited several fragments from my book. Here it is not even a matter of the author's pride — although, probably, even the famous donkey's jaw, which turned up to Samson, with which he beat a hundred Philistines, had the right to be proud. Rather, there was an impression that the book "World War II. Reboot" took its place in a kind of brickwork, a wall of unshakable argumentation.

True, we have a lot of programs, and on some subsequent ones, as I was told, Rozovsky managed to "salt" with his amazing "reference" ... Yes, yes, someone "armed" him with one "terrible document, "with which he walks on all talk shows.

- Stalin, it turns out (silence in the hall) ... in 1942 conducted secret negotiations (drumroll) - with ... Germany! (Applause. Flowers.)

8

Strangely, a director by profession, Rozovsky does not see the true source, the "archetype" of his role. Well, this is the purest Dobchinsky-Bobchinsky:

"He came, he came! ... And he doesn't pay money!"

It is even somewhat inconvenient to return to a long-recorded, no longer sensational fact: the United States and Great Britain also conducted separate negotiations, and this is no reason for state repentance. This is the everyday life of any coalition.

Yes, the Second World War was also fought on the diplomatic fronts. For example, having learned about the Allied agreement on the post-war inclusion of the Baltic republics in the USSR, Hitler immediately retorted: he declared them independent. What changed? Commandant's offices in Tallinn and Riga began to be called differently. What does this mean, besides the fact that the price of that Baltic "independence" is "pfenning on a market day"? (Yes, exactly: half a pfenning each for Estonia and Latvia.)

This suggests that diplomacy is the most important front in coalition wars. And one of the main means against the separate plans of the coalitions in World War II was their grandiose and enticing plans for a mutually beneficial and safe post-victory settlement. For example, the creation of the United Nations in 1944.

All lies and nonsense comes from "false positioning", when they oppose "our mossy empire, in which we urgently need to repent ... the cult of power" - "world", "universal" values, "UN tribunal" and so on "pure democracy."

Well, how can one not stop a pacifist concert here, not respond with such a formula, for example:

The UN project on the tables of its creators lay somewhere in the middle of the Bagration and Overlord plans, the projects of the Tehran and Yalta agendas, the Manhattan Project (atomic bomb). The UN is by no means a tender sprout cherished by democrats and pacifists, but the brainchild of war, the same as the Il-2 attack aircraft, the Tiger tank, the Spitfire, the Katyusha ...

zhzhzh

The last copies of the first edition of this book were sold out in those April days when Estonia began its World War II Reset. Including in the most literal sense, "rebooting" from the eyes away

9

above the monument "Bronze Soldier" and the remains of the liberators of Tallinn. A lot of different things were published about this, but here is an unconditional phenomenon that remained unnoticed. Just imagine how much the Russian community in Estonia has accumulated over the years of reasons and reasons for speaking out! Fair reasons for dissatisfaction and anger, recognized, among other things, by many European Commissions. Hundreds of thousands of stateless people - people without citizenship, restrictions in business, land ownership, the impossibility of holding state and municipal positions, economic discrimination.

BUT... The "Russian-speaking community" revolted over something completely intangible. Only "discrimination in the field of Memory, History" brought to rebellion and bloodshed! The editor of Radio Russia-St. Petersburg, Natalya Savochchik, whose broadcasts were then the voice of solidarity with the defenders of the Bronze Soldier of St. Petersburg, told me: "Your book should have hit those fascists on the heads!" Well, the second edition comes out a dozen pages heavier...

zhzh * x I thank the newspapers, magazines, TV and radio and all the response

who have dismantled my book on their paper or electronic pages. I hope the conversation continues.

Part one

"WWII - THIRD RELOAD"

Chapter 1

THE ORIGIN OF THE MAIN THEME OF THE BOOK AND SOME EXTERNAL REASONS FOR IT

According to the established tradition, the anniversaries (multiples of ten) of the opening of the Second Front are widely celebrated in Europe. In 2004, Russia was invited to the 60th anniversary, listened to compliments about its "outstanding role in the common Victory"... Everything is fine. One small wormhole remained, just from among the "external reasons" indicated in the title for the creation of this book, namely: on the previous anniversary, on the 50th anniversary, in 1994, the French administrators did not invite Russia for some reason. It would seem, well, the anniversary parade is more or less... However, it was still curious: what did this difference in the lists of participants in the celebrations of 1994 and 2004 mean? Have any new facts about that war been revealed? For example, just by 2004, the French suddenly found out that there was, it turns out, such a "Battle of Stalingrad", which contributed to the common Victory, and decided to invite the Russians?

But no, not yet... On February 9, 1943, the famous French writer Jean Richard-Bloc consoled his "humiliated and offended" on the radio:

Listen, Parisians! The first three divisions that penetrated Paris in June 1940 and desecrated our capital, these three German divisions - the 100th, 130th and 295th - do not exist anymore! They were destroyed at Stalingrad! The Russians have avenged Paris! The Russians will avenge France!..

It is clear that, in fact, military details and facts were not very much added to this researched "post-millennium" period, and it is unlikely that they, even if found, for

eleven

were interested in some of the fussy French organizing committees of 1994 and 2004...

Or maybe they are... a kind of intellectuals, aesthetes, and Russia-1994 is unattractive, and they simply did not want to see our drunken president-conductor suddenly try his hand at the parade also... tambour-major? Or maybe, on the contrary, they are such pragmatists: they invited Russia-2004, and at \$250 per barrel they would invite Kuwait and the Emirates to the Parade as "heroes of the second front"?!

Here is the second assumption and closer to the truth, though not in such a polemically pointed form, with the Kuwaitis-Emirates, but in the sense that it is the POST-war realities, political and economic conditions that form the current assessments even in purely military-historical spheres, leaving some veterans overboard, then leading others to the front line of the triumphal parades of the Victors.

The main reproaches to the USSR - let's bring to the limit the promises voiced a thousand times by European parliamentarians, human rights activists, etc.:

— You, the USSR, having expelled the Germans, established your dominance no better... again, Czech Republic-68... tanks, Hungary-56... tanks...

And so on, along the entire perimeter, geographically delineated in Yalta, and chronologically - from "Yalta to Perestroika" ... Claims against the USSR-Russia are constant, almost monotonous, and in 1994, relaying them, they only slightly tightened up "volume knob". And in July 2009, for example, the PACE committee equated "Stalinism and fascism" with its resolution.

The nature of these reproaches, their secret, almost subconscious motives, was the subject of my book "The Second World War. Reboot". Its first edition, January 2007, sold out rather quickly, and in June 2007 a second, significantly expanded and corrected (not without that) edition was released. I fixate on these dates in 2007: not that it was so important for me to prioritize the use of the now popular term "reset" over Barack Obama in 2008, but I also would not want to fall into the category of authors who quickly respond to thrown slogans. This "union of reloaders" is already growing before our eyes. Then I will take the role of a restorer for myself.

ADOLF HITLER AS A TRUST MANAGER OF EUROPE CJSC

It was the essay of 2005 under such a somewhat provocative title that opened this "restoration work".

Look at the map of Europe at the beginning of the decisive period of that war (June 1941). Everything is literally smeared with brown paint. Darker shade - Germany and allies: Italy, Finland, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria. Lighter - the countries captured: France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Gecia. Unconquered island - Great Britain, well ... the pink eastern ocean - the USSR

But the same color of Poland and Czechoslovakia obscures one important difference. The Poles fought, left the ruins to the Germans. The Czechs handed over all of themselves intact. Only the Skoda and ChKD factories more than doubled the capacity of fascist tank building, about this quite surprising things will be reported below. About how the German tanks of 1938 could not reach the capital of the "Anschlussed" Austria along the highway - they simply failed! The fact that broken German tanks were transported to the parade in Vienna by rail (although it collects dust on the distant historical shelves, it is, in fact, deadly! Especially in combination with another fact: in the 1930s, first place and 40% Czechoslovakia belonged to the world sales of weapons and military equipment, and the best Czech tanks in Europe were sold all over the world.

The same color of France and Yugoslavia is also a lie. And the point is not only in the French capitulation, which transferred [to Hitler in trust (trust) management the entire military-industrial potential intact. It is today that a kind of politically correct, equal perception is encouraged:

- Well ... France, the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary - everything is the same, everything is Europe! After all, everyone participates in the Eurovision Song Contest!

But in World War II, on the balance sheet of "United (Hitler) Europe" Poland, Yugoslavia - these were the capture

farms (burnt down), and the Czech Republic, France - industrial megacities, inherited "in working condition".

The second layer of politically correct putty removed in my book is...

In any history of World War II you will read:

"... in all the occupied countries, a resistance movement has unfolded." That is, for political reasons, it was important to emphasize that all nations rose up ... Only you know that the most powerful resistance movement inflicted on Hitler was in Germany! And it was carefully calculated back in Nuremberg! In the chapter "Measurement of specific "Resistivity" there will be more about this.

That is, "Free France", "Poppies", the hero-pilot of Saint-Exupery, the Little Prince - all this, no doubt, is beautiful. But... as they sang in the First World War: "In the German war, only guns are valuable", and in the "Second German War", it turns out, too. The power of concerns, state potentials and the power of any, the most noble personalities and organizations are incomparable things. The Czech and French military-industrial complexes handed over to the Fuhrer are from the macro world, the underground members are from the micro.

Think about what a terrible thing it is - inertia, coarseness of perception! Even in the Soviet "History of the Second World War" - in the mandatory, on-duty chapter of the "Resistance Movement in Europe" - it lists, for example, "the French miners' strike of 1943

of the year".

And somehow this is accepted mechanically, swallowed up by readers for several generations, without realizing that "strike" is a word from a peaceful lexicon, like "slippers". Legal, polite, peaceful form of dialogue with employers. Take this thought to its logical conclusion... After all, a "strike" can become a means, a threat only in the case of well-established joint work. Only in a well-functioning mine or factory can a "strike" mean something!

Objectively speaking, even today's unemployed young Arabs, burning cars in Paris, is a much higher degree of "Resistance". For them, not included in the "economic mechanism", how to go on strike? (...)

But if the resistance movements of the French and Czechs are incomparable with their state potentials in the service of

14

Hitler, then with what then can they be compared, correctly compared? With the German resistance movement, of course!

Military historian Jacques Bergier: The "Red Chapel" (the German Resistance, more precisely, even half of it. - I.Sh.) definitely destroyed more than 200,000 soldiers of the fascist bloc."

Goering, in Nuremberg: "She (the Red Chapel) destroyed at least 10 of our divisions."

But in Germany, besides the "Red Chapel", oriented towards Moscow, there was also the "Black Chapel": diplomats, senior officials, field marshals, generals. In 1938, she, the "Black Chapel", led by Beck, Brauchitsch prepared the overthrow of Hitler. Field Marshal Witzleben, commander of the 3rd, Berlin, military district, was rehearsing the capture of the Reich Chancellery.

Even the SS took a wait-and-see attitude. An expressive detail captured by the historian Marabini: in the summer of 1938, they stopped giving "heil" in Berlin. For two months, "the coin stood on its edge," and, as the conspirators of 1944 admitted before their execution, only the "Munich Summit," the main foreign and domestic political trump card, saved Hitler. They, the German Resistance, "knocked out" four field marshals (arrested, executed, committed suicide): Kluge, Witzleben, Rommel, Beck. This is more than, in fact, "on the battlefield", three field marshals were lost here. And from those knocked out by the German Resistance: intelligence chief Admiral Canaris, chief of the general staff of the 30s, Colonel General von Hammerstein-Ekford, commander of the 4th Panzer Group Hoepner, Hitler's military adviser Wilhelm Scheidt (repeatedly handed over the most secret plans to the Allies), Eduard Wagner (chief quartermaster, head of the supply department [of the headquarters], ambassador in Rome Hassel, head of the French military administration Stulpnagel ...

In this overture chapter, for now, I will only briefly show how desperately the painting "World War II" is in need of historical restoration.

Evaluate, for example, such a brilliant fragment from the official history of the Skoda plant. There, after much evidence of the unique quality of their tanks, comes the following passage:

15

<... Until 1939, the Skoda plant produced 295 tanks. Unfortunately, after the occupation of Czechoslovakia, its tanks were included in the German fascist units and participated in the capture of Poland, France, in the war against the Soviet Union. The last Czech tank

production was destroyed on December 10, 1941 during the liberation of the city of Klin near Moscow.

But ... that the old stock of tanks (295 units made for the Czech army) ended by December 10, 1941 - this is the most common practice, the reality of war, rotation. The "consumption" of the German T-P itself was about the same. And what about since 1939, Skoda, which became the core of the German industrial group Negtapp-Soeppo-äeKe (Hermann Goering Werke), throughout the war produced the German tank R2 KrNo. trucks, heavy caterpillar tractors... — e710 all questions are not for us, the main office was in Germany!

It looks like a corporate holiday is planned at the shkodny shops (and in the future, a national one!):
December 10 is the Day of the end of responsibility for tanks ...

And another giant - CKD-Prague - entered the German concern VMM. Produced: the best among Wehrmacht light and medium tanks R2 Kr/\-38 (this is the Czech tank TMHP-5\$, the world leader in sales) - 1411 units were manufactured. Self-propelled gun "Merder", the best anti-tank self-propelled gun of that war "Hertzer", circulation - 2584 pieces.

And thousands of Prague tanks made in 1939-1945 are still listed in military reference books as German products.

Only desperate Allied bombing in March 1945 reduced the productivity of the Czech industrial giants by 50%, but in general the "Czech seven-year plan" of work for Hitler was successfully completed and exceeded.

In the book "World War II. Reloaded" I introduced the following chapter: "The history of the Second World War in fifty text messages", bringing some provisions to the format of a slogan. Regarding the Czech point: "Before the Soviet tanks of 1968, there were Czech tanks in Prague in Minsk, Smolensk, Kyiv, Stalingrad and near Moscow!"

Winston Churchill "Second World War" (Syukish .5. Tre Zesopa No. 14 V/ag. [op4op, 1951):

16

"... and 3 because of the fall of Czechoslovakia, we lost the strength of 35 divisions. And besides, the Skoda factories, the second most important arsenal in Europe, fell into the hands of the enemy, which from August 38th to September 39th produced almost the same amount of products as all British factories for the same period".

Many observers, and above all Alexander Melikhov, in a long article in the Izvestia newspaper "Czech Tanks, or Who Are the Judges?", in general, highly appreciated this "reset" approach to the history of the Second World War. And Valentin Nikolaev advised to rise from the tanks to the heavens. It turns out that the most cursed aircraft in our infantry was not the Junkers, but the reconnaissance spotter Focke-Wulf-189 ("frame"), whose appearance meant inevitable and high-precision shelling. It was a high-altitude, extremely maneuverable and practically indestructible aircraft.

And that Focke-Wulf-189 was produced ... at the Werk-3 factories in French Bordeaux (hello to the current "airbuses" manufactured there! That's what it means to take care of preserving your real estate and industrial potential!). .. and also at the Aero factory in ... Prague (well, again this "City of Masters"!).

I had a question for Czech historians ("How long did the Škoda and ŷKD factories stand idle, maybe even went on strike, in connection with the change of the flag? A week or less?")... but let's stop here. Further tank-Czech research can make the history of World War II as one-sided as the current "politically correct" interpretations. Let's deal with "political engines". From "Skoda" to "Munich"...

And from the "United Europe" of the current, Brussels, to the "United Europe-1", Berlin... Superposition and comparison of the contours of these "Europas" on the maps of 1941 and 1999 can explain a lot in the history of World War II . And not only.

The choice (or, in modern terms, "bifurcation point") was not only for armored Czechoslovaks. Chosen by the whole of Europe. For example, Yugoslavia. The Serbs (albeit with the Croat Tito at the head) organized a partisan army that attracted 12 or more divisions [of Germany and her allies.

17

The Croats created a state, on the contrary, which gave the fascist bloc 5 divisions. And it is very interesting that this choice of the 1930s is superimposed by the choice of Europe of the 1990s: who to "root" for in the newly split Yugoslavia? Here and there, terror, ethnic cleansing. But who will be bombed in the end? ..

And quite recently, in 2004, the point of choice: Ukraine. Who counted the votes more correctly in the Radv elections? Lviv or Donetsk? Both here and there - only legally equivalent protocols of the local election commissions and mutual accusations. There is basically no other source information. Which of the protocols will Europe CJSC support? And again, obviously playing along with the region where the SS division "Galicia" was formed - and "where there are partisans, Krasnodon," Young Guard "- well, they probably think worse there." Only a new "politically correct tinting": now their clients are not "brown", but "orange". Rebranding!

HOW THE "UNITED EUROPE-1" HAS BEEN DEVELOPED

We are introducing indexing so as not to be confused with the current "United Europe-2", which coincides with Europe First in terms of geography, a set of nations and, as was shown above, in terms of some of our political preferences. Perhaps, even for sure, the current politicians, who so solemnly proclaimed "OE-2", will also be unpleasantly reminded of this predecessor. But what can you do, there was after all "United (by Hitler) Europe." And it turns out that liberals and even Nobel Peace Prize winners were also involved in its birth!

Today there is already a whole trend: criticism of globalism and political correctness. The era and the world seem strange and unsteady, the stupidity of today's politicians is unique. But no. Here is a portrait of the time between the world wars in Winston Churchill's "History...", so to speak, "Selected Places".

"What was imposed on the Germans was the ideal that the liberals of the West aspired to. France demanded borders along the Rhine, but England and the United States believed that the inclusion of areas with a German population was contrary to the principle

18

self-determination of nations. Clemenceau had to agree to this in exchange for Anglo-American guarantees. And later, the US Senate, disregarding Wilson's signature, did not ratify the guarantee contract... They said that we needed to know the US constitution better. At the Washington Conference of 21, far-reaching proposals for naval armaments were made, and the British and Americans began to zealously sink their battleships and destroy military bases. This was done on the basis of a strange logic, according to which it is immoral to disarm the vanquished, unless the victors also lose their weapons. Until 1931, the victors concentrated their efforts on extorting annual reparations from Germany. But payments could only be made through American loans, so the whole procedure was reduced to absurdity. The result of the conference (Locarno, 1925) is a general guarantee agreement and arbitration agreements between Germany and France, Germany and Belgium, Germany and Poland, Germany and Czechoslovakia. Austin Chamberlain received the Order of the Garter and the Nobel Peace Prize..."

And now think about it: the Nobel Prize for Peace was given to a man (Chamberlain) who paved the way to the Second World War, and... it just so happens that it is precisely for this "blazing"

deed (in Locarno). This fact is not advertised very much today, probably, so as not to casually discredit the award, which was received in recent years ... "well, just holy people ... just angels of political correctness." Churchill's "History..." fills the historical vacuum. The policy of England in the 1930s still needs some interpretation. By the way, Churchill received his Nobel Prize in 1953 not like Chamberlain and Gorbachev - "For Peace", but in terms of literature. In addition to his "History of the Second World War", I will have occasion to quote also his "History of the English-speaking peoples." This is almost Chestertonian elegance, plus involvement in all the details of politics. Although it is difficult to call the present picture of the 1920-1930s politics. A twenty-year orgy of pacifism. Not supporting British disarmament meant losing the election for sure. Oxford Students' Union brings

19

a public oath never to fight for your country. In France, the communists of Maurice Thorez have, in modern terms, a "blocking package". In order to pass the law on two-year service, Minister Laval has to fly to Moscow.

Churchill: "... only the Soviets could allow a significant part of the French, who had confidence in them, to support this law." Stalin's approval was received. The French army can now reach 100 divisions. Above all this, you will agree, a draft of absurdity is already hovering. But Churchill elegantly avoids judgments and continues: "Afterward, Laval asked Stalin: 'Could you do something to encourage Catholics in Russia? It would help me so much with my dad.'" - "Wow! Stalin exclaimed. - Dad! And how many divisions does he have?"..."

Those familiar with this passage usually focus on Stalin, the stern pragmatist, even the Pope's divisionist. But in my opinion, the Frenchman Laval is absolutely delightful here. This is his "something for" ... That is, the texture of the issue, some specific need of Soviet Catholics (to repair such and such a church, to release such and such a padre) - no, and it is not necessary! "Something" is for a bargaining chip in dealings with dad. When I want to imagine a European politician, I close my eyes and actually see the satisfied salesman Laval. Encouraged, going from Moscow, "on the way back, drop by to dad" ...

Another theme of several chapters of this book will be the story of how Roosevelt and Churchill, while dividing Europe into spheres of influence with Stalin, not only recognized but jointly designed a new system of guarantees. Instead of the failed Versailles. A multi-level system: the UN, the Security Council with five permanent members, the division of Germany, spheres of influence, or, one might say, spheres of security, buffers. The "national sovereignties" granted by Versailles were not just laid down at Hitler's feet, in some cases they turned out to be simply fuel for the fascist machine. And the most egregious, but also pushed aside today to the periphery of public attention, cases, such as cooperation between Hitler and independent Lithuania, will also be considered in this book.

20

After all, not only Germany, but also Europe attacked the USSR - which means, accordingly, not only East Germany, but also Eastern Europe will become the Soviet sphere of security. Iron Yalta logic. So the tanks in the Czech Republic in 1968 are a consequence of how the war ended, how it went and how the war started. Munich investigation...

For a hundred and fifty years now, the aphorism has been circulating: "Generals are always preparing for the last war." "And the salary is paid for the future," one witty journalist recently conjectured. Maybe our rulers were mistaken, insuring themselves in 1968, according to the canons of 1940. But—the proverb doesn't lie—that's what all governments, all general staffs do—prepare for the war in which they participated. Those who have not competed with the Wehrmacht for 4 years have a completely different political heredity and military doctrine.

And there is no need to nod: "Yes, it was the case, they tried to reinforce socialism with tanks in 1968." Another "prominent Marxist" was General of the Army Pavlovsky (organizer of the operation "Czech Republic-68"). It is better to tell the truth: "We defended our sphere of influence, the sphere of security." Or the above slogan: "Before the Soviet tanks of 1968, there were Czech tanks in Prague in Minsk, Smolensk and Stalingrad!"

The balance of forces in 1938 (1582 aircraft, 469 tanks, 2 million people - Czechs, and 2500 aircraft, 720 tanks, 2.2 million people - Germans) allowed Beneš to hold on without any help (not received from France, rejected from the USSR). And the topic of comparing the quality levels of military equipment was previously announced and will be discussed in detail in the "Czech" chapter of the book. After studying the quality of the "Czech dowry", the German generals once again admitted that they had escaped the biggest trouble, that the risk of defeat in Czechoslovakia in 1938 was even greater than in Poland in 1939 and in France in 1940.

Here Churchill laments not only about 469 unfired tanks and 1582 aircraft that fell into the hands of the Germans. The main thing is the best factories in Europe.

Yes, it is possible to illustrate this without any geopolitics. Imagine...

Beer pub. Everyone sits and looks into their circles. The big man tumbles in. Courageous. They are waiting. Tall hwa

21

melts behind the lapel of the first, sir. That one is a dick! - gives the attacker a purse and a revolver that happened to be in his pocket. Big man grabs Monsieur and gets another purse, knife, brass knuckles. The last, comrade, who decided to resist, gets both bullet and stab wounds. Roughened and embittered, he nevertheless twists the big man and ... leaves him on the floor.

For some reason, there is no way out of this strange bar...

Barely recovered from these disgusting scenes of violence, sir and monsieur demand that their property be returned to them. "We know, comrade, that now you won't need a revolver with a knife to protect yourself against a big man."

And the comrade, instead of the simplest answer: "How can YOU know this?", starts muttering something about socialism ...

Denmark, Belgium, Holland also had a choice: to transfer their state potentials to the Germans or not. And now they will call the very formulation of such a question savagery, fanaticism. And it is already somehow impolite to remind that someone had to start real resistance, as in Warsaw, Stalingrad, Leningrad. Millions of prisoners, factories were seized from us too, but those who decided to resist regarded this only as a criminal mistake or betrayal. And as a result: SMERSH, detachments, repressions. This choice determines everything from politics to the post-war psyche. But only after the war? Many ugly actions on the eve of 194] are, after all, the preparations of a man who has narrowed his eyes and made up his mind. By the same pub analogy: he threw off a Baltic spectator, armed himself with his chair. The "non-aggression pact" was actually the choice of the place and the minute of the upcoming fight...

I have already asked Czech historians a question about Skoda, now they have one slight reproach about the death of their own compatriot! A very famous case, described a million times: one Prague student saw Soviet tanks in 1968 and, offended by national feelings, set himself on fire ...

It was you, Czech historians, who could save the guy, give him a vaccine, for example ... Having told, for example, how the "hero of Munich" Chamberlain reported in the House of Commons, after

22

after [Hitler took not only the Sudetenland, but the whole of Czechoslovakia: "... we are simply witnessing a revision of the borders established by the Treaty of Versailles. I don't know if there are people who think that the borders will always remain the same. I think I have said enough about Czechoslovakia..."]

It was you, pan historians, who could save that student of 1968, and not push him, like Erdman's characters - a suicide: "Face! Soviet tanks! Protest! And by the way, you and matches."

Chapter 3

ABOUT THE "RIGHT OF LEADING" A BIG WAR "AND ABOUT TURNED UNDER THE ARM

What about "the same Pact", "the same taste": "Molotov-Ribbentrop?", "Soviet aggression in the Baltics"? The study of the nature of these accusations is, in fact, the subject of this entire book. Whoever decides on a "Great War" has the right to a Great Maneuver. But what is this term - "Big War" and is it legitimate to introduce it?

The answer will be detailed, with the involvement of some of my previous publications, including Hugo Grotius, the author of the concepts of "natural law" and most of the provisions of the "law of war and peace". In the meantime, a few historical precedents.

So, for example, the English of the 20th century who decided on the "Great War" knew for themselves that they were the most irreconcilable, the most final enemies of Napoleon, and with this self-justification they could conclude any number of truces "with Boni", sign the Peace of Amiens with him, and then to destroy a completely neutral Denmark ("Just so that the Danish fleet does not accidentally get to Boni").

AMATEUR INQUIRIES

And who is, in fact, this Bonnie?

"Boney" is a nickname that did not leave the pages of the then British newspapers. In English - something like "baby" (remember "Boni-M"?). As applied to Bonaparte, this had a pronounced contemptuous diminutive meaning.

23

And the one who demanded that only "Napoleon" be addressed to him, after all, he considered the simple undistorted "Bonaparte" to be the greatest insult to himself and France. So "Boni" in British (and only in British at that time!) newspapers was not just a joke: it was a guarantee of irreconcilable enmity, a guarantee of a war of annihilation. Just as 500 years before that, innocent and useless, in general, Mongol ambassadors were slaughtered, knowing that after that there could never be peace with the Mongols.

And the Soviet newspapers of those years with caricatures of Hitler are the same guarantee. And the mutual moral "incitement" of fascists and communists is a quite serious, "material" argument.

And the fact that we are blamed for "the same Pact" and the changed tone of the Soviet newspapers of 1940... it's as if the surviving inhabitants of Auschwitz began to blame the Russian soldiers opening the gate: "You screwed up near Vyazma, and near Kharkov - twice. And in Stalingrad they dragged on for a long time, and near Kursk. And it was near Leningrad... And as a result, they came to liberate us much later than they should have been... according to our calculations... And, of course, it was impossible to enter the three Baltic republics."

But "coincidences are innumerable" — it was in the Baltic that Great Britain wrote the brightest page in the code of this right. The "Great War" was waged by her in the 18th and 20th centuries against Napoleon.

The fleet of this, as you know, was defeated at Trafalgar, and the invasion of Britain did not seem to threaten. But purely theoretically, Napoleon could create a new fleet for himself? Could. And having wished to recreate the fleet, Napoleon, using his continental power, could probably capture some country with a significant fleet, and "involve it in the cause"? Quite. And who else in Europe has a "significant fleet"? And here is the Kingdom of Denmark. But it is still pursuing a line of impeccable neutrality. What if something changes? Especially according to the research of one of our (British) writers: "Some kind of rot in the Danish state!" W. Shakespeare "Hamlet".

Need to insure.

On July 26, 1807, a British squadron of 25 ships, 40 frigates and small craft left Yarmouth. For her

24

an armada of 380 transport ships with a 20,000-strong landing force marched in several detachments. | August British squadron appeared in the Great Belt. On August 8, the British Ambassador Jackson appeared to the Crown Prince Regent Frederick and declared that England was reliably aware of Napoleon's intention to force Denmark into an alliance with France. England cannot allow this to happen, and in order to ensure that this does not happen, she demands that Denmark turn over her entire fleet to her and that English troops be allowed to occupy Zeeland, the island on which the capital of Denmark is located. The prince refused. Then the British fleet bombarded Copenhagen for six days, and then landed troops. Half of the city burned down, more than two thousand of its inhabitants died in the fire. The elderly (72-year-old) General Peyman, who commanded the Danish troops, capitulated. The British took away the entire Danish fleet, burned the shipyards and the naval arsenal. Prince Frederik did not approve the surrender and ordered Peyman to be brought to court-martial ...

It was this fire of Copenhagen that struck the Danish philosopher Kierkegaard for the rest of his life.

But maybe the example of 1807 is too outdated? After all, since then so many humanists and human rights activists "shone in the land of Europe". Then here is an example from the very actual one, 1940. Iceland at that time was part of Denmark (we will not go into the details of their union now). And when Hitler captured Denmark in April 1940, Great Britain, without a declaration of war, without even two lines of declaration at all, captured Iceland. The reason is the most elementary: Denmark falls under Hitler anyway, but it cannot be all, entirely. The island of Iceland will come in handy for the war.

And how it was justified! If Iceland were German, not a single Anglo-American convoy (not only that famous RO-seventeenth, but also RO-first) would not have reached Murmansk - it would not even have left America! Iceland - the absolute commanding height in the North Atlantic - was impossible to pass.

British law, as you know, is based on "precedent". The USSR also waged a "Great War" against fascism. There have already been direct battles with the Germans and Italians in Spain, with Japan at Khasan and Khalkhin Gol. Truce, pacts with the main enemy, of course, were concluded (as well as

25

between the British and Napoleon), but this did not change the main fact: the final instance of resolving the "Great Historical Conflict" would be the fight between the USSR and Germany. And our accession in 1940 of the most important strategic foothold, the three republics, falls short of the British-Danish precedent in terms of parameters. Including... the absence of a lot of blood and destruction.

Today's politically correct historians click on the abacus: "So, 1940 - the USSR crushed three democratic states - three knuckles to the left, minus."

We can agree ... Although with some amendments. Latvia at that time ceased to be a "democratic republic" - the dictatorship of Ulmanis. Lithuania had declared a year earlier that it could not vouch for itself, nor for its territorial integrity, nor for its neutrality.

The story was like this. According to the Treaty of Versailles, the former German city of Memel (with its surroundings) was called Klaipeda and transferred to Lithuania.

LITHUANIAN DIVERTISSION OF 1939

Memel, by the way, in a certain historical period was the capital and the last foothold of Prussia, which was being achieved by Napoleon. It is not known whether the victorious powers remembered this at Versailles when they took this most important port from Germany, the main thing is different: they guaranteed protection to Lithuania - her and her gains. These guarantees (to Lithuania) were absolutely similar to the guarantees given to Poland, in pursuance of which, in fact, war on Germany was declared, 5 months after Klaipeda! Moreover, the guarantors of Lithuanian sovereignty over Klaipeda, in addition to England, France, were also Italy, Japan (also winners of Versailles)...

On March 20, 1939, German Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop announced to his Lithuanian colleague I. Urbshis: "... if the Lithuanian government is inclined to return the Klaipeda region by agreement, then the German government is ready to meet halfway and satisfy the interests of Lithuania in the port of Klaipeda. If the Lithuanian government does not follow this reasonable path, then the Klaipeda region will be returned to Germany in a different way. If there about

26

clashes erupted and at least one German died, then it would no longer be we, the politicians, who would be engaged in this matter, but the troops, having begun the campaign, would not know where they would stop. After the outbreak of hostilities, the German government would no longer enter into any negotiations.

Without waiting for an official response from Lithuania, Adolf Hitler went to Memel on the flagship of the German Navy, the battleship Deutschland. The Lithuanians were given official and humiliating advice: "In order to avoid wasting time, send plenipotentiaries to Berlin on a special plane to sign a document on the transfer of the Memel region to Germany."

The armed forces of Lithuania consisted of a cavalry brigade and three infantry divisions with a total strength of 24,000 men, with 44 light tanks and 110 aircraft. And only one military training ship with six machine guns and two Oerlikon guns of twenty-millimeter caliber. Lithuania, of course, is smaller than Poland, but... Germany actually did not have a common border with it! The only option is landing. But this, for many reasons, Britain could not allow. Parliament and the British public could allow the ground forces "difficulties of deployment", "Strange War". But the British Navy is always ready and everywhere! He fought absolutely seriously during the months of the "Strange War", and rushed to save Norway, however, unsuccessfully - but that was in 1940, by that time the Czechs had worked for [Hitler for almost a year and a half.

So, in order to get help from Britain and France, Lithuania had to reject Hitler's demands, turn to guarantor countries and, theoretically, possibly be attacked. And then the Second World War would have started in April, and not in May 1939.

As Lithuanian historians state, "it would be possible to write a heroic page in history with the blood of thousands of soldiers. But in territorial terms, Lithuania would only lose in the long run. After all, German Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop made it clear that by starting a battle, the Lithuanians would lose the whole country. Of course, it hurts a lot when they chop off a hand, but it's foolish to substitute the head as well..."

On March 21, the Council of Ministers, "finding no other way out, considers that it is compelled to accept the demand of the German right

27

government. In the face of the threat posed by Germany, the Council of Ministers finds it impossible to comply with the requirements of Article 15 of the Convention concluded between Lithuania, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan on the territory of Klaipeda. The Minister of Foreign Affairs is instructed only to inform the plenipotentiary ministers of France and Great Britain in Kaunas about the demand of the German government to return the Klaipeda region to the Reich."

That is, based on its national interests (plus, remember: /Germany will take into account the interests of Lithuania in the Klaipeda port), Lithuania does not turn to the guarantor countries for help and gives up Memel. Significantly strengthening the positions of Germany in the Baltic and also significantly worsening the position of anyone who decided on a "Great War" with Hitler.

Surrendering, it turns out, "on a shout", Lithuania significantly strengthened Hitler in the Baltic and thereby significantly worsened the position of all those who nevertheless decide, in their words, "... it is foolish to substitute your head ...".

The sequence here is simple and linear, there is none

Landsbergis will not rearrange the dates. March 1939 - Lithuania objectively worked for Hitler. August 1940 - this peeling Lithuania includes

USSR troops

Yes ... it was in a conversation with Rustam Arifdzhanov in a program on the Russian News Service that I, in the radio impromptu mode, said: Lithuania was peeling off into the hands of Hitler.

1945 - Lithuania receives the same Klaipeda plus Vilnius recaptured by Soviet blood (Vilnius, however, was donated by the Soviet Union to Lithuania even in 1940).

2007 - Lithuania demands 24 billion dollars - "penalty for the Soviet occupation."

Here is the Lithuanian logic. After all, they are right in their own way, in a politovian way: "... it is foolish to turn the Germans' head on," did Russia turn its head on? So she's stupid! — So, we have to take a chance with this account — "24 billion — FOR A FOOL". And the "United Europe-2" (Brussels), after all, it retains the sympathies of the "United Europe-1" (Berlin) - maybe it will help!> "...

From the point of view of the current situation and the modern understanding of international law, one can argue endlessly about what the accession by the Soviet Union of those three republics

28

glare corresponds to signs of aggression. BUT... just in order for the international situation itself to become "modern", politically correct - in general, the one that it is now - the liquidation of the Nazi Reich was required, the victory of the "Great War"!

Of course, if the Balts of the Munich era would get into a time machine, or rather, get into it with all their republics, and fly immediately to 2006, where you have both the Council of Europe and PACE... But even this fantasy not so transcendental in comparison with the cynicism of the "Klaipeda heroes" teaching Russia: how, where, when it was necessary to carry out military operations against Hitler.

After all, first Strasbourg (the capital of PACE), Prague and Vilnius must be liberated so that those smart people who will tell HOW it was right to release them and what fines are due for violation of their rules can settle there again.

But perhaps the precedent of Britain insuring itself with Denmark in 1807 is too old, and with Iceland in 1940 too insignificant? And "in the cultural XX century" Stalin really should have somehow organized a communication session and consulted with Havel, Landsbergis, Clinton and Madeleine Albright: how should the "Great War" be waged?

But then, here is another example, again from 1940. True, here again the protagonist is Britain - but this is precisely because it was she, the island of Britain, who more often decided to confront at any cost.

Chapter 4 "The Last Argument of Kings"

Many are ready to put an equal sign between the fire and the fire brigade.

W. Churchill

Question No. 1. Name the most significant naval battle of World War II in the European theater of operations.

29

Question number 2. Name its participants.

Correct answers: No. 1. The battle of July 3, 1940 at Mers-el-Kebira (the coast of Algeria).

The answer to question number 2. - It will probably surprise many.

AMATEUR INQUIRIES

And who, in fact, fought at this Mers-el-Kebira? Correct answer number 2: British and French.

It is hard to believe, and yet Mers el-Kebira is the largest military clash in European maritime theaters, both in terms of the composition of the opposing forces (three battleships against four) and the tactical result (one battleship sunk, two damaged) - this is not counting dozens of destroyers and auxiliary vessels.

The strategic operation of the British Navy, which aimed to eliminate the danger of strengthening the enemy fleets by French ships, received the code name "Catapult". The concept of the operation was to take control (capture, disarmament, internment) or destroy the maximum possible number of combat units of the French Navy at various bases, both on British territory and beyond its borders.

On June 15, the French notified the British government of their intention to conclude a truce with the Germans. Churchill's reply: "Our treaty forbidding separate negotiations for an armistice or peace was concluded with the French Republic and not with any government or statesman. Therefore, the honor of France is associated with him. Nevertheless, provided that the French fleet be sent to British ports immediately and before negotiations, His Majesty's Government gives its full consent to the French Government making an inquiry to ascertain the terms of the truce for France. His Majesty's Government, determined to continue the war, exclude themselves entirely from any part in the above request for a truce."

In the early morning of July 3, all French ships stationed in British ports were captured by detachments of the Royal Marines. Armed resistance was provided by the crew

thirty

there were only two ships: the destroyer "Mistral" and the submarine "Surkuf". This indirectly confirmed the fears of the British that another part of the French fleet would fall into the hands of the Germans without hindrance. Indeed, apart from the "X" compound neutralized in Alexandria and several cruisers, destroyers, the aircraft carrier "Bearn" and small ships scattered around the world, only two very old battleships took refuge in English ports - "Pari" and "Courbet", 2 super destroyers (leader), 8 destroyers, 7 submarines - in total no more than a tenth of

the French fleet, judging by displacement, and even less so, judging by their real strength. 90% of French naval power was concentrated in Mediterranean ports.

Now the floor to E. Granovsky, the author of the excellent work "The Shadow of Trafalgar. The operation of the British Navy against the ships of the French fleet in Mers-el-Kebir":

"Having retired shortly before the start of the war, 57-year-old Vice Admiral James Somerville was now urgently returned to the service of His Majesty to carry out a responsible task: to give the French an ultimatum demanding to surrender the ships to the British or go to American ports, and if they refuse to obey, destroy them. What was the reason for such a choice of commander? Among other English admirals, Somerville stood out, perhaps, for some eccentricity. "As a person," comments historian Warren Tute, "Somerville was an active, witty extrovert who savored his reputation as a showman (for example, on the captain's bridge he stood with a parrot on his shoulder, dressed as Captain Flint! - I.Sh.). This is the tradition that has been going on since Nelson's time. The ability to produce an effect is an integral part of the nature of any outstanding leader ... "

Yes, this is, in its own way, a very interesting moment in Granovsky. General unification, the gigantic armies of the 20th century made us forget many features of the true "military style" of past eras. Indeed, when the whole nation puts on overcoats, when a total war unfolds, there is already no one to REMEMBER ABOUT THAT ... That, in particular, that when the wars were noble, class, there was much more room for all sorts of "self-expressions". And eccentricity was recognized as a manifestation of the nature of any outstanding leader ... Under Waterloo (and this is well noticed in Bondarchuk's film)

31

top British officers flaunted before the ranks in the hats and frock coats of their clubs. Remembering this, one can correctly understand the jokes of our military genius - Suvorov, who sometimes sobbed at military councils (for example, at the most difficult moment of the Alpine campaign), jumped, crowed like a rooster.

You can also recall Kutuzov's contempt for smooth and correct reasoning, and his falling asleep (sometimes even with snoring) at military councils. (Contempt for military wisdom is, for example, Leo Tolstoy's artistic conjecture, but Kutuzov's drowsiness at military councils is a fact of history.)

I deliberately detain the reader's attention precisely on the eccentricity of real military geniuses. Where it is necessary to fight for real (the Russian army, the English fleet), they understand that eccentricity is the best remedy for stupidity, formalism, fearful politeness. From everything-everything that already today will be summed up under this unique term: political correctness!

Politically correct, correct, everything in detail was Lord Chamberlain. The entire Munich Treaty of 1938 was also politically correct in form - this book will prove it. The British and the French even calculated the amount of compensation to the Czechs for the herds of cattle that they would not have time to drive away from the Sudetenland! Entire areas of politics will also be cited (for example, in the religious issue), where, of course, the Fuhrer himself was politically correct.

And Suvorov, Kutuzov and Nelson were eccentric. And Admiral James Somerville, who won the most significant (in the European theater) naval battle of the Second World War and went out on the bridge, dressed up as Captain Flint, with a parrot on his shoulder, was also anti-politically correct. It attacked the fleet of a country with which Britain was not at war (like the USSR with Poland in 1939!), and, in addition to those French ships sunk, it had another extremely important, almost decisive impact on the course of World War II, about which there is still little who mentions. But on page 26 this fact is given, and I think you will agree that the Merville battle of Mers el Kebir should take its rightful place in the history of the Second World War.

From him (James Somerville) did not expect excessive service zeal, but such a
outgoing opera

32

the radio required a performer to match. No one in the Navy, from cabin boy to Lord of the Admiralty, was enthusiastic about the prospect of fighting against the French. The militant initiative came from above, from the War Cabinet headed by Churchill. As a result of the military council held in the evening of June 30 in the admiral's saloon of the battlecruiser Hood, which, in addition to three admirals and staff ranks, was attended by the commanders of all major ships, as well as the 8th and 13th destroyer flotillas, Somerville at noon | July reported to the Admiralty that he was categorically against the use of force. The commander of the Mediterranean Fleet, Andrew Cunningham, joined this opinion: "The use of force in Oran can have serious consequences." The answer from London came at 18.46 of the same day: "The British government has firmly decided to destroy the French ships if none of the conditions of the ultimatum are accepted."

A farewell telegram from the government to the commander of the "H" formation said: "You are entrusted with one of the most unpleasant and difficult tasks that the British naval commanders have ever faced, but we have opted for you and believe that you will do your duty to end"

It seems to me that Churchill in this telegram was styled after Admiral Nelson's famous flag signal, the last one before the opening of fire at the Battle of Trafalgar: "England hopes that everyone will do his duty."

Connection "H" (H) Somerville included: the battlecruiser "Hood", the battleships "Resolution" and "Valient", the aircraft carrier "Ark Royal", the light cruisers "Aretyuza" and "Enterprise", 11 destroyers. The French battleships Dunkirk, Strasbourg, Provence, Brittany, the leaders of the Volta, Mogador, Tiger, Lynx ", "Kersint" and "Terrible", hydro-aircraft carrier "Commandant Test". In Oran (several miles to the east) were destroyers, patrol boats, minesweepers, and unfinished ships transferred from Toulon.

Formation "H" approached Mers-el-Kebir on the morning of July 3, 1940.

In Somerville's ultimatum, written on behalf of "His Majesty's Government", after being reminded of

33

joint military service, the perfidy of the Germans, and the previous agreement between the governments of Britain and France that, before surrendering on land, the French fleet would join the British or be scuttled, the French commander of naval forces at Mers-el-Kebir and Oran were offered a choice of four course of action:

| 1) go to sea and join the British fleet to continue the fight until victory over Germany and Italy;

2) go to sea with reduced crews to follow to British ports, after which the French sailors will be immediately repatriated, and the ships will be kept for France until the end of the war (full monetary compensation was offered for losses and damage);

3) in case of unwillingness to generally admit the possibility of using French ships against the Germans and Italians, in order not to violate the truce with them, go out under an English escort with reduced crews to French ports in the West Indies (for example, to Martinique) or to US ports, where the ships will be disarmed and stored until the end of the war, and the crews will be repatriated;

4) sink the ships within 6 hours...

In case of refusal of the above proposal, I have an order from His Majesty's Government to use all necessary forces to prevent your ships from falling into the hands of the Germans or Italians (...).

And now imagine all the "options" of the French Admiral Jansoul. Germans in Paris. The French government has concluded a truce, maybe close to capitulation, but it is his, the French government, trying to save the country in the current conditions. Surrendering the ships to the British means violating the terms of the truce, and according to the German ultimatum received that morning, a "revision of the terms of the truce" will follow (of course, in the direction of making the terms more difficult for France). And even to flood them by the order of the commander-in-chief that remained in force, he cannot. It remains only to fight. It's wild to even imagine: for the first time since 1815 (Waterloo), the French will fight with the British ... with whom they fought side by side a week ago!

And now imagine the variants of the British admiral: in front of him are not some dodgy neutrals, but heroic sailors, his former fighting friends. which are just less

34

everyone is to blame for the defeat of the ground forces of France. Their combat work with the British was quite successful. (And no Vaclav Havel nearby, no Gorbachev with Novodvorskaya, and no one from PACE - to at least consult: shoot fighting friends or ...)

At 10:50 a.m., a signal was raised on the destroyer Foxhound: "If the terms of the ultimatum are not accepted, Admiral Somerville will not allow the French ships to leave the harbor." In confirmation of this, at 12.30 British seaplanes dropped several magnetic mines on the main fairway.

The ultimatum expired at 14:00. At 13.11 a new signal was hoisted on the Foxhound: "If you accept the proposals, raise a square flag on the main mast; otherwise I open fire at 14.11.

From the moment the English destroyer appeared in the harbor of Mers-el-Kebir, the French ships parted pairs, the crews dispersed to combat posts. The coastal batteries were now ready to open fire. At the airfields, 42 fighters were standing, warming up the engines for the start. All the ships in Oran were ready to go to sea, and 4 submarines were just waiting for the order to form a barrier between Capes Anguille and Falcon. Trawlers have already trawled the fairway from English mines. All French forces in the Mediterranean were alerted, the 3rd squadron in Toulon of four heavy cruisers and twelve destroyers and six cruisers in Algiers were ordered to go to sea ready for battle and rush to connect with Admiral Jansoul, about which he had to warn the British.

And Somerville was already on a combat course. His squadron in the formation of the wake was 14,000 meters north-north-west of Mers-el-Kebir, heading - 70, speed - 20 knots. At 16.54 (17.54 British time) the first volley was fired. Fifteen-inch shells from the Resolution fell short of range into the pier behind which the French ships stood, showering them with a hail of stones and fragments. A minute and a half later, the Provence was the first to respond, firing 340-mm shells directly between the masts of the Dunkirk standing to its right. Admiral Jansoul was not going to fight at anchor, just a cramped harbor did not allow all the ships to start moving at the same time (which was what the British were counting on!). The battleships were ordered to line up in a column in order:

35

Strasbourg, Dunkirk, Provence, Brittany. Super destroyers had to go to sea on their own. The Strasbourg, whose stern mooring lines and anchor chain had been given up even before the first shell hit the pier, began to move immediately. And as soon as he left the parking lot, a shell hit the pier, the fragments of which killed the halyards on the ship, the signal rail and pierced the pipe.

At 17.10 (18.10) captain | Rank Louis Collins brought the Strasbourg to the main fairway and headed for the sea with a 15-knot course. Behind him rushed 6 destroyers.

When a salvo of 381-mm shells hit the pier, the mooring lines were given up on the Dunkirk and the stern chain was poisoned. The tug, which helped to weigh anchor, was forced to cut off the mooring lines when the second salvo hit the pier. The Dunkirk commander ordered that the tanks of aviation fuel be emptied immediately, and at 1700 hours gave the order to open fire with the main caliber. [103] also came into play [30-mm guns. Since Dunkirk was the closest ship to the British, Hooda, a former partner in hunting down German raiders, concentrated his fire on it. At the moment when the French ship began to move away from its anchorage, the first shell from the "Hood" hit him in the stern and, passing through the hangar and non-commissioned officers' cabins, exited through the side skin 2.5 meters below the waterline. This projectile did not detonate because the thin plates it pierced were not enough to cock the fuse. However, in its passage through the Dune Kerk, it broke part of the port side electrical wiring, disabled the crane for lifting seaplanes and caused the port side fuel tank to flood. The return fire was quick and accurate, although distance determination was difficult due to the terrain and being between the Dunkirk and the British fort Santon.

Around the same time, Brittany received a hit, and at 17.03 a 381-mm projectile hit Provence, which was waiting for Dunkirk to enter the fairway in order to follow it. A fire started in the stern of the Provence and a large leak opened. I had to stick the ship to the shore with its bow at an E-meter depth. By 17.07 the fire engulfed the Brittany from bow to stern, and two minutes later the old battleship began to capsize and suddenly exploded, taking the lives of 977 crew members. The rest began to be rescued from seaplanes

36

sports "Commandant Test", which miraculously avoided hits during the entire battle.

The Dunkirk, entering the fairway with a 12-knot course, was hit by a salvo of three 381-mm shells. The first hit the roof of turret number 2, heavily pressing the armor. Most of the projectile ricocheted and fell to the ground about 2,000 meters from the ship. A piece of armor or part of the projectile hit the charging tray inside the right "semi-tower", igniting the first two quarters of the powder cartridges being unloaded. All the servants on the right side perished in the smoke and flames, but the left "hut" continued to operate - the armored partition isolated the damage.

The second shell hit next to the 2-gun 130-mm starboard turret, closer to the center of the ship, and pierced the 115-mm armored deck. The projectile severely damaged the reloading compartment of the tower, blocking the supply of ammunition. Continuing its movement towards the center of the ship, it broke through two anti-fragmentation bulkheads and exploded in the compartment of air conditioners and fans. The compartment was completely destroyed, almost all the personnel died. In the meantime, in the reloading compartment on the starboard side, several cartridge cases caught fire and several 130-mm shells loaded into the elevator exploded. And here all the servants were killed. The explosion also occurred at the air duct to the forward engine room. Hot gases, flames and thick clouds of yellow smoke penetrated into the compartment through the armor grate in the lower armored deck, where 20 people died and only ten managed to escape, and all the mechanisms failed. This hit turned out to be very serious, as it led to a power outage, due to which the fire control system failed. The undamaged bow turret had to continue firing under local control.

The third shell fell into the water next to the starboard side a little further aft from the second, dived under the 225-mm armor belt and, having broken through all the structures, exploded. The explosion destroyed the lower armored deck throughout these compartments, the armored bevel over the fuel tank. The shell fragments caused a fire in the right boiler, damaged pipeline valves and broke the main steam pipeline between the boiler and the turbine unit. The escaping superheated steam with a temperature of 350 degrees caused fatal burns to the personnel of the KO (boiler department), who were standing in open places.

On the Dunkirk, after these hits, the internal shafts continued to operate, which gave a speed of no more than 20 knots. Damage to the starboard cables caused a brief interruption in the power supply to the stern, until the port side network was turned on. I had to switch to manual steering. With the failure of one of the main substations, bow emergency diesel generators were turned on. The emergency lighting came on, turret No. 1 continued to fire fairly frequently at the Hood flagship.

In total, before receiving the ceasefire order at 17.10, Dunkirk fired 40 330-mm shells at the British flagship, the volleys of which fell very tightly. By this moment, after 13 minutes of shooting almost motionless ships in the harbor, the situation no longer looked unpunished for the British. "Dunkirk" and coastal batteries fired intensely, which became more and more accurate, "Strasbourg" with destroyers almost went to sea. The only thing missing was the Motador, which, when leaving the harbor, slowed down to let the tugboat through, and a second later received a 381-mm projectile in the stern. The explosion detonated 16 depth charges, and the destroyer's stern was torn off. But he was able to stick his nose to the shore at a depth of about 6 meters and, with the help of small ships approaching from Oran, began to extinguish the fire. The English, satisfied with sinking one and damaging three ships, turned west and put up a smokescreen. "Strasbourg" with five destroyers went on a breakthrough. "Lynx" and "Tiger" attacked the submarine "Proteus" with depth charges, preventing her from attacking the battleship. The Strasbourg itself opened heavy fire on the English destroyer Wrestler, which was guarding the exit from the harbor, forcing it to quickly retreat under the cover of a smoke screen. French ships began to develop full speed. At Cape Canastel they were joined by six more destroyers from Oran. To the northwest, within firing range, the English aircraft carrier Ark Royal was visible, practically defenseless against 330-mm and 130-mm shells. But the fight didn't happen. On the other hand, six Swordfish with 124-kg bombs, escorted from the deck of the Ark Royal, escorted by two Skewes, attacked the Strasbourg at [7.44 (18.44)]. But they did not achieve hits, and with dense and accurate anti-aircraft fire, one Skue was shot down, and two Swordfish were so damaged that they fell into the sea on the way back.

Admiral Somerville decided to give chase on the flagship Hood, the only one that could catch up with the French ship. At 19:00 (20:00) the distance between Hood and Strasbourg was 44,000 m and did not seem to decrease. In an attempt to reduce the speed of the French ship, Somerville ordered the Ark Royal to attack the retreating enemy with torpedo bombers. After 40-50 minutes, the Swordfish carried out two attacks with a short interval, but all the torpedoes dropped outside the curtain of destroyers passed by. The destroyer "Pursyuvant" (from Oran) informed the battleship in advance about the sighted torpedoes, and "Strasbourg" each time managed to shift the rudder in time. The chase had to be stopped. Moreover, the destroyers following the Hood were running out of fuel, the Valient and Resolution were in a dangerous area without an anti-submarine escort, and from everywhere there were reports that strong detachments of cruisers and destroyers were approaching from Algeria. This meant being drawn into a night battle with superior forces. Compound "H" returned to Gibraltar on July 4..."

AMATEUR INQUIRIES

And why, in fact, so much detail about this Mers-el-Kebir?

But because it is not only the most significant at sea, but also the most characteristic battle of the "Great War", revealing the essence of this term: England, neither before nor after Mers-el-Kebira, was NOT at war with France. The "Great War" is a war against the Big Enemy, in which it is absolutely unimportant who is in a quarrel with whom, in peace, in a truce, in marriage. The Great Enemy is Hitler. And for the sake of eliminating even the very likelihood of someone's warships getting to him, they must be destroyed.

And just like that 381-mm projectile that ricocheted from the Dunkirk tower, flew 2 kilometers and hit the city, in this battle, each projectile also ricochets on politically correct crucian carp, blaming Britain, and most of all Russia for the actions of 1940. Here is the real face of the Great War. In a stunning description of Granovsky.

... "Strasbourg" continued to leave at a 25-knot course until an accident occurred in one of the boiler rooms. As a result, five people died, and the speed had to be reduced to 20 knots. After 45 minutes damage

39

was eliminated, and the ship again brought the speed to 25 knots. Having rounded the southern tip of Sardinia in order to avoid new clashes with the "H" formation, at 20.10 on July 4, "Strasbourg", accompanied by the leaders of "Volta", "Tiger" and "Terrible", arrived in Toulon.

The Dunkirk was in such a state that Admiral Jenseul ordered the damaged ship to leave the fairway and go to the harbor of Saint-Andre, where Fort Saitcome and the countryside could provide some protection from British artillery fire. After 3 minutes, "Dunkirk" complied with the order and anchored at a depth of 15 meters. The crew proceeded to inspect the damage.

Turret No. 3 (2-gun 130-mm starboard side) was out of action from a fire in the reloading compartment, the servants of which died ... Turret No. 4 was forced to close up the bow 130-mm cellars during the battle. At about 20:00, new explosions occurred in the elevator of tower No. 3.

Fortunately, "Dunkirk" was in the base. Admiral Jenseul ordered to stick him aground. Before touching the ground, the shell hole that caused the flooding of several fuel tanks and empty starboard compartments was sealed. The evacuation of unnecessary personnel began, 400 people were left on board to carry out repairs. At about 19 o'clock, the tugboats Estrel and Cotentin, together with the patrol ships Ter Neuve and Setus, pulled the battleship to the shore, where it ran aground at a depth of 8 meters with about 30 meters of the central part of the hull. Plastering began in places where the skin had been pierced. After the full restoration of the power supply, they began the hardest work - the search and identification of the dead comrades.

On July 4, Admiral Esteve, commander of naval forces in North Africa, issued a communiqué stating that "Dunkirk's damage was minor and would be quickly repaired." This ill-advised statement prompted a swift response from the Royal Navy. On the evening of July 5, the "H" formation again went to sea, leaving the low-speed "Resolution" in the base. Admiral Somerville decided, instead of conducting another artillery battle, to act quite modernly - to use aircraft from the Ark aircraft carrier to attack the Dunkirk, which had landed on the shore.

40

Royal". At 0520 hours on 6 July, while 90 miles from Oran, the Ark Royal launched 12 Swordfish torpedo bombers escorted by 12 Skua fighters. The torpedoes were set to a speed of 27 knots and a travel depth of about 4 meters. The air defenses of Mers el Kebir were not ready to repulse the attack at dawn, and only the second wave of aircraft met more intense anti-aircraft fire. Then came the intervention of French fighters.

Unfortunately, the commander of the Dunkirk evacuated the servants of anti-aircraft guns to the shore, leaving only the personnel of the emergency parties on board. The patrol vessel "Ter Nev" stood at the side, receiving some members of the crew and coffins with the dead on July 3. During this sad procedure, at 06.28 a raid of British aircraft began, which went on the attack in three waves. The two Swordfish of the first wave dropped their torpedoes prematurely, and they exploded on impact without causing any harm. After 9 minutes, the second wave approached, but none of the three torpedoes dropped hit the Dunkirk. But one torpedo hit Ter Nev, which was just in a hurry to move away from the battleship. The explosion literally tore the small ship in half, and the wreckage

its superstructures showered Dunkirk. At 0650, another 6 Swordfish appeared with fighter cover. The link, which came from the starboard side, came under heavy anti-aircraft fire and was attacked by fighters. Dropped torpedoes again did not reach the target. The last group of three cars attacked from the port side. This time, two torpedoes rushed towards the Dunkirk diagonally from the port side of the krumbol. One hit the Estrel tug, which was about 70 meters from the battleship, and literally blew it off the surface of the water. The second, apparently with a faulty depth gauge, passed under the keel of the Dunkirk and, hitting the aft part of the wreckage of the Ter Neuve, caused the detonation of forty-two 100-kilogram depth charges, despite the absence of fuses in them. The consequences of the explosion were terrible. A hole about 40 meters long was formed in the starboard plating. Several belt armor plates were displaced, and water filled the side protection system. The steel plate above the armor belt was torn off by the force of the explosion and thrown onto the deck, burying several people under it. Anti-torpedo bulkhead on the stretch

41.

40 meters long was detached from its anchorages, other watertight bulkheads were torn or deformed. There was a strong list to starboard, and the ship sank with its bow so that the water rose above the armor belt. Compartments behind the damaged bulkhead flooded with salt water and liquid fuel. As a result of this attack and the previous battle on the Dunkirk, 210

Human.

A temporary plaster was put on the hole, and on August 8, Dunkirk was dragged into free water. Repair work progressed very slowly. And where were the French in a hurry? Only on February 19, 1942, Dunkirk went to sea in complete secrecy. When the workers arrived in the morning, they saw their tools neatly stacked on the embankment and... nothing else. At 23.00 the next day, the ship reached Toulon, carrying on board some scaffolding from Mers-el-Kebir (...).

In addition to the excellent work of E. Granovsky, those who wish to receive "confirmation from foreign sources" can refer to the book "War at Sea", authors: Chester William Nimitz (Admiral of the US Navy, and now, as Mayakovsky would write, "The Man and the Aircraft Carrier") and Elmer Belmont Potter. And also to the "Encyclopedia of Ships" - this site zShr.6zi.Bu seems to use a translation of the English book: N!\$ory 97 N.M.\$.. Noo4 PezgisNop oh! Fe ERgepsv Nee a { Megs E1-KeYg, SgAa Lu 1940. Vu Rautaeg ZiB-[Gleschepap { Kopa @. RYIRz.

This is about the "texture" of the main naval battle of World War II. But among the "moral-political" assessments in the history of the Second World War, you will find dozens like THESE:

"In general, these fears (the transition of the French fleet to the Germans) look somewhat far-fetched. Most likely, the reason that forced the British to treat their former ally so cruelly was

involved something else...

..by defeating the French fleet at Mers-el-Kebir, the British are believed to have created fertile ground for collaborationism in France, not to mention the moral side of the matter."

In fact, my entire book is directed against false political correctness that gives rise to such assessments. Right

42

The "Great War" is the only fair criterion for evaluating all the acts that took place during its period. Those who do not like this "innovation" - the term "Great War", can be reminded that Hugo Grotius (we will refer to him many more times), who actually developed the "old rules of war", was also perceived as an innovator in his time.

The British at Mars-el-Kebir showed the whole world their determination to fight Nazi [Germany to the end. And one more thing — its unbound by the "old" rules of warfare. A

more... as the American historian Alistair Horn writes, "... it was this dramatic attack on the French fleet that most of all convinced Roosevelt of Churchill's (and Great Britain's) intention to continue the war, this is also confirmed by his closest collaborator, Harry Hopkins."

Think again and again about the above evidence. This is the sense in which I previously called the battle of Admiral Somerville one of the most important in World War II. The opinion, the decision of the President of the United States regarding a future war and a future ally was formed thanks to Mers el-Kebira! The fact that the "Great War" does not coincide with any dates of signing treaties, declarations of separate, private wars and truces is just proved by the British destruction of Copenhagen in 1807, and Mers-el-Kebir, but also. ... accession by the Soviet Union of those three Baltic republics.

Our difference from England is only that they had to conduct a naval blockade of the Enemy, we - to hold the land front. That is why England was engaged in "dubious fleets", and the USSR was engaged in "dubious republics".

But, as it turned out, our land, front-line mission is doubly difficult. That during the war it is harder to keep the front than to conduct naval operations, this is, in general, obvious. But there is also a "post-war heaviness": now you compare the flow of claims for preventive measures to Britain (for Copenhagen, Mers el-Kebira, Iceland) and to us - for the Baltic states ...

The beginning of the "Great War", always gradual, approximate, vague, is the period when the Big Enemy is defined. And then too: the "Big War" does not depend on all private wars, truces and pacts. And it ends only when this Big Enemy will be ... Yes, yes, just

43

the very fact of the Nuremberg Trials, which still causes legal controversy, shows that the end of the "Great War" is also a special case.

BUT it is precisely for the international situation itself to become "modern", "legal", politically correct, in general, the way it is now, and victory in the "Big War" is required! I repeat: first, Strasbourg (the capital of PACE), Prague and Vilnius must be liberated, so that those wise men who will tell you how it was right to release them and what fines are due for violation of their rules can settle there again.

Chapter 5 THE TERMINOLOGICAL CRISIS

So, in fact, my analytical article was called in Nezavisimaya Gazeta in the issue of October 19, 2001. The date will tell you both the socio-political background of that time and, accordingly, the editorial task.

A month after the attack on the skyscrapers. "... The world has changed (.. We have entered a new era, eriu!.." etc. Much has been said about the "terrorist-kamikaze" essence of opponents, with historical examples.

On this "hot issue", the modest contribution of my then article was to find the oldest documented mention of "kamikaze". You will be surprised, but this is the Bible, the Book of Maccabees. For the Jews, the exploits of the Maccabees, who restored the kingdom of Judah, are a national shrine. Maccabi sports societies, etc. But what was the feat of one of the Maccabee brothers? Imagine: a battle that decides the fate of the nation, Tsar Antiochus (the most consistent exterminator of Jewry in history) throws ancient tanks into the attack - battle elephants in armor, with towers for archers ... The only thing that the valiant Romans forgave themselves - it is flight, capitulation before the elephants of Pyrrhus the Great (approximately, by the way, in the same years when Antiochus was withdrawing his "tanks").

Further from the First Book of Maccabees, chapter 6, vv. 43-46: "Then Eleazar (the younger brother of the commander Judah Mac

44

Cavea) saw that one of the elephants was covered with royal armor and surpassed everyone ... and he betrayed himself in order to save the people and acquire an eternal name for himself ... and he ran under that elephant, and killed him, and fell on him elephant".

Well, isn't this throw, ripping open an elephant's belly, like throwing grenades under a tank? Today SMM reporters would call Maccabeus a "kamikaze"...

But that article also had a "super task". Then President Bush Jr. actively introduced a new term: "rogue states". Interestingly, every American terminological innovation in international law ended in a war. Clinton's "The primacy of universal values over the idea of national sovereignty" and the attack on Serbia. "Outcast", it seems, was the same quite "working" term. This gave me reason to turn to the founder of most of the modern military-legal provisions and terms - Hugo Grotius. And to publish, probably, the most extensive study on this topic in a socio-political, non-special periodical.

Hugo [rotius — Dutch scientist of the 17th century. Historian and lawyer. Introduced into use the most important idea of "natural law". His Gri books on the law of war and peace became the basis of military jurisprudence. To this day, all declarations of war and treaties of peace, the Geneva Conventions, etc. - all talk about wars is conducted in his terms. Grotian ideas, including the idea of national sovereignty, became the theoretical basis of the Westphalian Peace Treaties of 1648. Which, in turn, became the starting point of our era.

Grotius investigated the origin of the word "war" - BeYit. It turns out that in Latin it came from the ancient Roman form: Chiejit. What did the duel mean? Among the Greeks, on the contrary, the word "war", ro | eto \$, came from a multitude (polyphony, multivitamins). That is, the Greek war, discord came from the disintegration (into multitudes).

Thus, the two languages, Latin and Greek, from which almost all the scientific terms of our civilization are taken, bring out from different sides the two fathers of war: the duel (dieYit, duel) and the plurality (disintegration)...

45

One postulate of Gotius: "You must not kill those who are persecuted by fate, in particular those who joined the belligerent side under duress" - waited for its time and was the basis of the Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War. Prisoners of war — drafted, forced by the state to conduct hostilities — as opposed to mercenaries.

Fundamentally and [Rotian's division of wars into public, private and mixed.

Public ones are conducted by civil authorities, subjects of public law; private - by persons who do not have civil power; mixed: on the one hand, the state is fighting, on the other, a private person.

The last point needs to be understood: a private person can have his own army. The most relevant example of 2001: the United States - Bin Laden.

If anyone remembers, in September 2001, NATO declared a state of war. True, in the column "to whom" - a unique case - a gap. So to speak, "to the bearer."

On "mixed" wars, I then, in 2001, gave another block of examples.

The explosion on the Kursk nuclear submarine and suspicions of another underwater ram as its possible cause caused, among other things, serious publications. In the same Nezavisimaya Gazeta, Rear Admiral Valery Aleksin gave a detailed history of attempts to reach agreements with the Americans on safe navigation and the reasons for the failure of these agreements. He also gave a complete history of all incidents with our and American submarines over the past 45 years. Aleksin also proposed his own draft of a "more perfect agreement" plus, as a necessary addition, a "Protocol on the exchange of experience and cooperation between fleets...".

Projects of Rear Admiral Aleksin are perhaps the most perfect, detailed (a text with special terminology for half a newspaper page) rules for the behavior of submarines. That, however, does not exclude an amateurish view of this problem. After all, agreements, peace treaties and non-aggression pacts are signed and ratified for centuries, and it can be seen that, in addition to the internal perfection of the treaty, external motives are no less important: "do it or don't do it." And in the most impeccably written agreements, clues, ambiguous interpretations are found, and, conversely, semi-verbal agreements work for a long time.

46

Let us first pay attention to the peculiarity, the uniqueness of the situation. For decades, the land armies of the USSR and the USA have been coexisting in an balanced and peaceful way. The air forces, for example in their space incarnation, even cooperate closely. (Soyuz-Apollo cigarettes are already thirty years old.) General staff officers, presidents in chief, and defense ministers visit each other, receptions and briefings are held in Moscow and Brussels. And only the Naval Forces, submariners, act almost the same as they would have acted in the conditions of a full-scale declared war. (The missiles of nuclear submarines are aimed at strategic objects, and "for each other" under water is only a ram.)

Imagine: on the Borodino field, our and the French infantry are fiercely fighting for flashes, and nearby, for example, cavalymen Murat and Uvarov are "brotherlings", arrange joint concerts and presentations. Seems strange...

But this "strangeness" is supported, however, by other examples from naval clashes. Example I came across somehow ... almost humorous.

Throughout the eighteenth century, there was a struggle between England and France. Historians sometimes refer to this as the Second Hundred Years' War, in a figurative sense. That was about a dozen wars, beginning with the War of the Spanish Succession of 1700-1714. and before the Napoleonic wars, which are already passing into the age of the LSH. All these wars ended with correct peace treaties. But if in Europe the states of peace/war were strictly observed, then on the distant seas things were going on... And somehow, in the West Indies, a French caravan parted ways with the British frigate Dunkirk. Suddenly, shots are fired, cannonballs are flying. The captain of the French - several months on the road - does not know what is there, in the capitals. He grabs a mouthpiece: "Hey, on the Dunkirk! Do we have peace or war there?!"

The Briton, also in a shout, shouts to the Frenchman: "Peace! World!" and without a pause, without even bothering to lower his voice: "Starboard! Plea!"

But even these examples, despite their paradoxical nature, fit perfectly into the "Grotian geometry". In the ocean, in international waters, the captain of a ship becomes a dual figure. He is an object, a military official of the state, he is also a private person (at least until the next session of communication with the earth). His day

47

actions - the next subsection "the rights of war and peace." The issuance of "Letters of marque" - how to say, the rights to limited piracy, it seems - confirms this.

WITH A NEW OUTSIDE OF YOU, DEAR GENTLEMEN!

And already after this brief study of the "Grotian" terms, tested for centuries, we can turn to the novelty Mademoiselle 03A: "rogue states." The term implies the presence of something in common in this list: Libya, Belarus, Serbia, Iraq, Iran, North Korea. The authors insist that the appointment to the "outcasts" is not a whim of the Americans, not a personal antipathy of Bush. But then what? Not all of the countries on this list have red or green colors on their flags, not all of their presidents wear military uniforms, and not all of them have brutally menacing expressions in their photographs.
faces.

As long as the authors do not give a strict criterion for "outcast", only one indirect, communicative definition can be given, ros{ 1afit. So: a pariah country is outside the intensive world financial, human and commodity exchange. And to be specific: planes (of leading airlines) don't fly there, payments don't go there (banks' bank).

In 2001, I happened to participate in the organization of one Moscow RK action (the centenary of the Witte reform and the Kristall plant), which took place on September 17th. And now one fragment of the festive program of the holiday had to be canceled - precisely because on September 12, 13, 14 two "payments" did not go through and several necessary people could not fly from New York ...

That is, on September 11-14, undoubtedly objectively, the United States was a "rogue country". As they say, "do not swarm another term" ...

This concludes this brief historical excursion. The very origin of the term "war" is clarified, Grotian types of wars and some provisions of his "rights of war and peace" are listed. The latest novelties in this area are also indicated, the terms "universal values", "rogue country", which worked, for example, in Yugoslavia, as a counterbalance to the Grozian idea of "national sovereignty".

48

In the next chapter, I will try to outline in some way one very famous, but very false theoretical proposition and, on the "ruins of it", propose one new term.

Chapter 6

DIRECTION OF THE MAJOR IMPACT - VON CLAUSEWITZ

Yes, it was he, the former colonel of the Russian army, who returned to the Prussian army in 1814 and wrote the book On War, Karl Clausewitz.

Absolutely everyone knows his aphorism from that book: "War is the continuation of politics by other means." Clausewitz was revered by both Lenin (it was in Lenin's retelling that aphorism was known in the territory of "one-sixth"), and Mussolini, who called the translation of "On War" into Italian "...a great, truly fascist book." (In Italy, let me remind you, until 1943 "fascist" meant not a curse, but, on the contrary, the highest degree of praise.)

Instead of Clausewitz, I propose the historian Bruce Catton, who wrote: "A distinctive feature of modern warfare is that it itself takes command. Once started, it urgently requires completion and in the course of action initiates events that are beyond the control of man. Doing, as they think, only what is necessary for victory, people, without noticing it, change the very soil that nourishes the roots of society.

Only what we called the "Great War" above is Catton's "modern war." So be it, but you cannot but admit that the whole pathos of Catton is precisely that the war is the end
politicians.

Yes, in general, Engels also wrote about this, whose reputation, perhaps, was tarnished by friendship with cooperation with another bearded theorist who gave economic forecasts,

with "exactly the opposite". BUT ... Friedrich Engels, however, had his own independent international authority as a military scientist. The American Encyclopedia also ordered articles for him. And this is what he foresaw back in 1887: "For

49

Prussia-Germany, any war is no longer possible, except for a world war ... it would be a war of an unprecedented scale ... 8-10 million soldiers will strangle each other and at the same time devour Europe to such an extent ... the collapse of the old states and their routine wisdom ... dozens of crowns are lying on the pavement, and no one is found to pick them up.

What, and is this a "continuation of politics"? Agree that "the collapse of their routine wisdom" is clearly about old, pre-war political plans.

By the way, the war (World War I) between Russia and Germany continued into 1917. Is this a "continuation" of the tsarist policy of the abdicated, arrested tsar?.. This war continued even into 1918. Is this a continuation of the "bourgeois-provisional" policy of the fled Provisional Government and Kerensky disguised as a woman?

Absolutely everyone considered themselves losers in the First World War — it was the collapse of the entire world of Ve Erode ("beautiful era" — a stable designation of about two decades before the First World War. Progress, congresses...).

And even Trotsky's remark: "Modern wars are waged not with the weapons that the belligerent countries have on the eve of the war, but with the weapons they create in the process of the war itself" somehow indirectly says about the same thing. Modern warfare is always a new reality.

Let us now turn to the anecdote I cited in the "Munich chapter" of this book, which describes how...

"Somehow an Englishman, a Frenchman, a German and an Italian gathered in Munich ... And the German immediately announced that his troops would enter the Sudetenland - regardless of the negotiations. And then the Englishman, the Frenchman, the German and the Italian signed an agreement that really "let him in." And the Czech representatives Masaryk and Locatelli (surname) were really waiting - in the hallway. And also a German and an Englishman, in the same place, in Munich (since they had already arrived!), signed a separate agreement, which some corrosive historians call "the actual German-British pact on non-aggression "..."

It is known that three days before the heroes of the Munich anecdote got together, one of them, a German, received

50

Roosevelt (President Roosevelt) a letter with one very interesting phrase, which, in general, had nothing to do with Munich, but was still a very important phrase, which we will consider in the chapter "The Law of a Great War".

So, Roosevelt-President wrote to Hitler-Fuhrer then verbatim the following: "... the social structure of each country involved in the war may collapse." The man was wise. So what was he talking about: the "continuation" or the end of politics?

But perhaps there is no truth here at all, and another genius is right — Mao Zedong, who put into circulation the famous slogans: "A rifle gives birth to power" (it's more like a mill for me and Catton), and then just as easily "The Party governs rifle"?

Whom I would not like to resemble most of all in this chapter is the authors of books, and more often pamphlets (you probably came across), where Einstein's theory of relativity, Newton's laws or, in general, the whole world history, chronology and etc.

Of course, I will not undertake here, on 12 printed sheets, to refute the book "On War" by Clausewitz. I am simply stating that, besides Clausewitz, there are other theorists, and I will offer you a choice of the most final conclusions of their theories (subject, of course, to conscientious citation).

According to Clausewitz, war plays a subordinate role in relation to politics, and only politics determines the goals pursued by this or that war, the scale of the war, the amount of effort, etc. Thus, relations are given a purely hierarchical character when politics is assigned the role a control element higher in the hierarchy that determines and directs the course of hostilities and the military campaign as a whole.

Here is Clausewitz verbatim:

„...the thought may arise that politics can put forward demands before the war that it is not in a position to fulfill; but this hypothesis defies the natural and inevitable assumption that politics knows the instrument it intends to use.”

And here, for example, John Keegan (Zobp Keerap):

51

“For many societies, war provides more religious, cultural functions than purely political”.

The concept of culture is defined as “shared beliefs, values, associations, myths, taboos, imperatives, customs, traditions, traditions and style of thinking, speech and artistic expression that give stability to any society.”

Remember here the role of the Great Patriotic War in our minds, in the upbringing of generations!

According to Keegan, Clausewitz's statement "about the war as a continuation of ...", etc. - "incomplete, narrow and extremely inconsistent."

Russell Wigley (Kizze!eyew):

“... politics tends to become an instrument of war... war, once started, always tends to generate its own politics, create its own momentum (inertia), obsolete the political goals for which it was started, putting forward its political goals... the dynamics of a military conflict, especially when it tends to transition to total forms (highlighted by me. — I.Sh.), dictates its own limitations and subjugates politics.”

“Total forms” is, after all, another of the synonyms or one of the dimensions of what I conditionally call the “Great War” has been named. “Total”, “modern” (for Engels and Trotsky), national, Patriotic (for us), “world” — (for everyone).

And also the “Great World War” — so, if you look into the periodicals of that era, for a long time, approximately from 1915 until 1941 the First World War was called. Until, finally, they did not understand that the Second World War, which was already underway, was also a world war.

Martin van Creveld (Mat yap Sgeue! 4):

“If we proceed from the fact that war is a continuation of politics, then we must admit that war is a rational extension of the will of the state, that is, we are dealing with nothing more than a banal and meaningless cliché. Moreover, if the war is an expression of the will of the state, this means that it does not affect other, irrational aspects and motives that affect the war.”

52

According to Creveld, Clausewitz describes what the nature of war should be, but not its actual nature.

But so far there has been no confirmation in favor of the Clausewitzian postulate in the form of lightning strikes, a voice from heaven ("Listen to this, the truth abides in it!"), we are free to choose. True, it is unlikely that the listed John Keegan, Russell Wiggley, Martin van Creveld or Bruce Catton (mentioned at the beginning of the chapter) are so famous, and our Karl is a name, a brand that has been promoted and promoted for two centuries, including Hitler and Mussolini with Lenin.

Yes, yes, and on the last day, in the bunker, Hitler mentioned him in his political testament (although, perhaps, completely out of place):

"... By this, from the depths of my heart I express gratitude to all of you, as my only desire, that you, in spite of everything, do not want to give up the fight, but continue it further against the enemies of the fatherland, no matter where, faithful to the conviction of the great Clausewitz...>»

Here it is - "historical pop"! The real "fool's gold", more precisely, superficial vulgarities who are eager to start wars (world, civil) and do not imagine in their wretchedness that the war will not be the "continuation", but the "end" of politics!

In defense of Clausewitz, Peter Paret (Per Paret) writes: "... there is a detachment from the historical context in which the work was written, and Clausewitz appears "fragmentary and contradictory in his search due to the underdevelopment of our historical consciousness."

It is precisely this good description of "what the nature of war should be" that does not remind you of the famous Tolstoy description of the pre-Austerlitz Military Council?

Weyrother dictates a lengthy and ingenious disposition: "Der erste to the marchiren column ... zweiticke to the marchiren column ..." - and Napoleon is guaranteed to be destroyed. Here follows someone's timid remark that the mere advance of the French forward to the Pratzenovsky heights will immediately change the outcome of the battle - exactly the opposite. Weyrother looks at the dilettante in amazement: "No, such a nomination is not supposed."

53

Michel Handel (Mispae|Napae!) and a host of other scholars assert: "... it is not our interpretations that have changed, but the very nature of war... our difficulties in understanding Clausewitz are due to the fact that we live in a reality that is qualitatively different from the one in which he lived and worked.

Needless to say, in the "reality in which he lived" Clausewitz, there were no SS, gas chambers, stoves and everything else. However, in fact, he, Clausewitz, also participated in the Great War. "Big" – in the sense of the definition offered in this book, in a war of those that "takes command on its own" – and, we emphasize, participated quite worthily. As an officer, Russia can be grateful to Clausewitz for one significant episode. In 1812, the downtrodden, intimidated Prussia was forced to expose and subordinate to Napoleon a whole corps that fought with us in the direction of Riga. And the officer of the Russian service Clausewitz, having entered into negotiations with the Prussian corps commander, General York, contributed to his transfer to our side (although this happened at a time ... when Napoleon had long kept poison in his pocket, in case of captivity) ...

But in the manners and mores of the participants in that "Great War" (with Napoleon) there was still a lot from the influence of humanists, chivalry ... from the same Hugo Grotius. And those elements of novelty, totality that would later develop in such a way in the wars of the 20th century — Clausewitz did not see them.

But then we remembered the Austerlitz Military Council and Tolstoy's sarcasm about "Der erste column marcher", and it is already difficult to force ourselves to put aside the "War and Peace" taken for verification of quotations. Indeed, on the pages of a brilliant novel, by the way, Clausewitz himself appeared! True, once and in a moment, but what a moment it is ... On the night before the Battle of Borodino ...

".. Pierre Bezukhov approached Prince Andrei Bolkonsky and just wanted to start a conversation, when the hooves of three horses clattered along the road not far from the barn, and, looking in this direction, Prince Andrei recognized Wolzogen and Clausewitz, accompanied by a Cossack. They drove close, continuing to talk, and Pierre and Andrei involuntarily heard the following phrases:

— The war (Der krieg...) must be transferred into space (im Raum). This view I cannot praise enough, said one.

— Oh yeah (Oh, ya...)

54

— Oh, ya...

"Daim Raum," Prince Andrei repeated, angrily snorting his nose, when they drove past. "Them Raum left me with a father, and a son, and a sister in the Bald Mountains. That's what I told you - these gentlemen Germans will not win the battle tomorrow, but will only spoil how much their strength will be ... They gave him all of Europe and came to teach us ...

"So you think tomorrow's battle will be won?" asked Pierre.

"Yes, yes," Prince Andrei said absently. "One thing I would do if I had the power," he began again, "I would not take prisoners. What are prisoners? This is chivalry ... If there were no generosity in the war, then we would go only when it is worth it to go to certain death, as now ... Then all these Westphalians and Hessians led by Napoleon would not follow him to Russia, and we would not go to fight in Austria and Prussia, without knowing why. War is not a courtesy, but the most disgusting thing in life ...".

How difficult it is to interrupt Leo Tolstoy!.. Incidentally, Wolzogen, who, together with Clausewitz, trotted past Pierre and Prince Andrei, is also a genuine, historical character. Wolzogen was General Pfuel's adjutant. And Pfuel was in 1812 the author of the "Russian plan" for the war (the Drissa camp...etc.). And earlier, he was the author of the plan that ended with the Jeno-Aursted battle and the destruction of Prussia in two weeks ...

".. looking at Pfuel, Prince Andrey recalled both General Weyrother and General Mack (who surrendered near Ulm in 1805 and strongly "set up" the Russians)... – And then the author himself, Lev Nikolaevich, steps in behind Prince Andrey, in that famous passage: who and how self-confident (English, French, Italian):

— ... The German is self-confident worse than anyone, and harder than everyone, and more repulsive than everyone, because he imagines that he knows the truth, a science that he himself invented, but which for him is absolute truth. Such, obviously, was Pfuel>.

And if, after all that has been said, further explanations are required, why did Shumeiko take such an uprising on the late Kluzevits, I will sum it up.

Today, human rights activists and all those who rely on political correctness in the Council of Europe, PACE, Hollywood form

55

stereotypes, formulate claims, nurture generations. In a correct, Clausewitzian war, the most worthy politicians and "warriors" will be: the Danish king, in 1940, an hour and a half after the invasion, congratulating the Germans "on a job well done", the same Czechs, Lithuanians. And Britain, Yugoslavia, the USSR are responsible for many politically incorrect acts: only a fraction of them are listed above. The term "Great War" that I propose is what gives birth to a new reality with new rights! The "correct Clausewitz war" for the USSR would have begun only on June 22, 1941, and then the Polish campaign of 1939, the annexation

The Baltics of 1940 are subject to "peacetime crimes". But... The "big", non-Clausewitzian war began in 1938, in Munich!

The beginning of the "Big War" - gradual, approximate, blurred - is the period when the Big Enemy is defined. Threats, real preventive strikes against anyone who comes along, is an integral (most often, the initial) part of the "Great War". Whoever wants to refute this must then come up with a new term for the Anschluss of Austria, for Czechoslovakia, Mers-el-Kebira, Iceland, the Baltics. These were all major geopolitical or military actions - and all outside the chronological framework of formally declared wars.

And if "war is a continuation of politics" (and in the minds of the current PACE and "war is a continuation of political correctness"), then Russia will always be guilty, the object of claims (often official, financial claims). England, another participant in the "Great War", in general, will also be to blame, but in this case, they, as in Joseph Heller's novel "Catch-22", have another remedy: "double standards".

The most recent example: Lithuania, which played along with Hitler in 1939, Lithuania, which could have been treated like the French fleet in Mers-el-Kebir, but only in the "Great War", issues an "account for the occupation"!

"GREAT WAR" IN A SMALL KINGDOM

It is up to the readers to judge, but to illustrate the main theoretical position of my book, I choose examples rather on the principle of originality and entertaining. Perhaps there is

56

and some tables, diagrams, also confirming that "war is NOT a continuation of politics by other means". But it seems to me that in the realm of such not strictly defined concepts as "war" and "politics", the compilation of any chain of formal proofs can result in an endless dispute about terms. Therefore, one original and expressive fact, it seems to me, will be more convincing. Therefore, ... we will continue picking out the raisins from the buns of history.

Actually, the following example is one short and bright quotation, but, unfortunately, it requires not very short and, most likely, not so bright my explanations.

Winston Churchill in his "History of the English-speaking peoples" (A [1\$oru oYo {ne Enoy\$P-Zreakte Reor|6\$, 4 vols., MU 1956-1958) gives such an introduction to the story of the second civil war in England:

"The alignment of forces in the second civil war was utterly simple. King, Lords and Commons, landlords and merchants, city and peasantry, bishops and presbyters, Scots and the British Navy all opposed the New Model army. And the army coped with everything.

The following explanations are required here. The "disposition of forces" in the first civil war (1642-1646) was, on the contrary, extremely complex. It can be said that about ten different subjects fought, concluded truces and went from one side to another. Very approximately

you can describe it like this.

The aristocracy, the peasantry, the Anglican episcopate, the North and the West of the country were in favor of the king. The middle class, the merchant class, the navy, the Centre, the South, London are for Parliament.

The Irish, the Scottish Presbyterians were changing the front line.

Parliament from one side — "against the king" — split, and the parties to the conflict became some.

And in the midst of this complex political turmoil, Cromwell (by order of Parliament) gradually formed a "new model" army.

And when the Parliamentary (English) Presbyterians passed the law to dissolve the army in 1648, the new model army did not comply, and ... see further above.

57

Here it is, the logic of the Great War. For six years since 1642 there has been a "political war". The "army of the new model" was thus, according to Clausewitz, "another means of continuing politics." But once the quantitative growth of its (new army) power turned into a new quality, and ... the war continued on its own. All politicians, former enemies, all actors of the first war are gathering on one side. On the opposite side is the former "means", "another means" of one of them. And ... Churchill undoubtedly feels this whole paradox, which allows him to build such an elegant phrase: "... everyone opposed the army of the "new model". And the army coped with everything.

CIVIL WAR ALSO SOMETIMES ITSELF TAKES COMMAND

Whose indignation and even amazement I understand so well is the amazement and indignation of the heroes of our revolution and the Civil War somewhere in the early thirties. For brevity, let us personify them, imagine, for example, Comrade Zinoviev.

Behind such years... I went up to my waist in blood, seized and shot thousands of hostages. But the White Guards were also standing five kilometers from the Northern Labor Commune (as St. Petersburg was called at one time), they were five minutes from the capture and uplifting of the leader of the Comintern ...

And now, finally, silence and peace... The country is working. Power is preserved. Material goods are now distributed in proportion to the risks experienced... From the city of Zinovievsk (formerly Yelizavetgrad), work reports, greetings and gifts are sent to each glorious date... In terms of the level of "liberalization" of the USSR of the 20s, it was approximately equal to Russia of the 90s . Free entry and exit, foreigners walk around, the currency is convertible - change it and go see Europe. NEP. In the CPSU(b) - legal platforms and factions, discussion of various programs, almost in parliamentary forms. "Joint ventures" with Western firms, concessions. The army was reduced by 10 times and transferred to the extremely economical territorial-militia principle of recruitment, because - a complete Victory ... Everything seems to be - phew! - survived, sat out ... And suddenly, oh - 7 years later, somehow everything is wrapped up again ... Some kind of "aggravation of class

58

the howl of the struggle, "wreckers" came from somewhere, executions again, and, what is most terrible, more and more often - executions of "winners". Bolsheviks. Lenin Guard. Well, no logic!

In Russia, the "First Civil" alignment of forces was also complicated: whites, reds, greens, chieftains, interventionists, socialist-revolutionaries, monarchists. In VKG1(b) there are several groupings. The "siloviki" are grouped around three centers: the Headquarters of the Workers 'and Peasants' Red Army, the Revolutionary Military Council, and the Cheka. The Red Army, the Red Army as a whole, it must be admitted, did not then become the main novelty, a phenomenon, a key to victory, like the armies of the French and English revolutions. (In order not to argue here for a long time, let us simply recall that the Cromwellian "new model" conquered Ireland, the French one - in general, half of Europe, and our Red - failed in Poland.) It seems that, for a number of reasons, the main phenomenon, the main factor of the Victory in our "First Civilian" it was not the "army of the new model" (as in Cromwell), but ... the "police of the new model", the Cheka. Also, in general, "siloviki". Although she (the Cheka) remained at first only one of the power structures, under the command of the completely loyal Dzerzhinsky.

But our Civil War also takes command of itself. And the "new model police" suddenly slips out of the hands of two unconditional political leaders of the country with

1917 - Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council - and suddenly he chooses the head of a third-rate structure (the Secretariat of the Central Committee) as his leader - and brings the Civil War to its logical (total) end ...

To paraphrase Churchill, we can say:

..the surviving Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, Trotskyists, the workers' opposition, decists, trade unions, Zinovievists, kulaks, military experts, the Ryumin and Rykov groups, the Bukharinites, the Workers 'and Peasants' Red Army - all opposed the "new model police". And the police took care of everything.

Chapter 7 DISPUTES OF HISTORIANS WITH REZUN It is well known that today in the Russian military

historically

riography, the main dispute revolves around the idea "thrown in" by Suvorov-Rezun:

59

The USSR was planning an attack on Germany, and Hitler gave Stalin literally 2 weeks ahead of him (the "Suvorov" date of Stalin's attack was July 6, 1941).

The language of Suvorov-Rezun is bright, emotional, his arguments are often found in places "where the foot of a popular historian has never set foot before", they are always presented clearly and seemingly convincingly. The support of many Western media is also on his side. Here is the review in the preface to The Icebreaker: "Viktor Suvorov's opinion in the field of defense is becoming public opinion. He shapes it." — International Defense Review, Geneva, September 1989.

And historians, Russian patriots, find no less convincing counterarguments, proving that the USSR was planning a defensive war against Germany. For example, Alexey Isaev, Andrey Zorin, Oleg Tishkov operate with serious facts and are not inferior to Rezun in emotional persuasiveness.

I don't want to look like a magician, but I think (and I will try to prove it) that on one issue, the main one in this book, both points of view are, in general, correct and, most importantly ... quite patriotic! Yes, yes, it's terrible to pronounce, but the defector, traitor, anti-Soviet Rezun has the main, historical, thesis - by no means anti-Soviet. (But a completely different matter is his political thesis: Stalin's responsibility for Hitler's rise.)

The mechanics of this focus is simple. Take the two options discussed:

- 1) The USSR planned to defend itself against [Germany;
- 2) The USSR planned to attack Germany.

Add a third option (tested at that time by the whole of Europe!): 3) the USSR planned to go over to the side of Germany.

Then combine the first two options, and you get:

- 1) the USSR planned to fight with [germany;
- 2) The USSR planned to go over to the side of Germany.

Of course, everyone understands perfectly well that there could be no talk of a transition according to the "Czech model" ("preemptive capitulation"), but after all, there were enough transition models at that time in Europe: upon crossing the border (Denmark), on the fact of the bombing (Netherlands), on the fact of airborne landings (Norway), on the fact of a real threat to the capital (Fran

60

tion), on the fact of finding common geopolitical goals (Finland, Hungary, Romania). Now let's assume that "that same pact" is really a prologue to the transition to the Nazi camp (which is often blamed on the USSR), and not to a fierce struggle ...

Agree that with such a formulation of the question, both Rezunov's and anti-Rezun's arguments are, in fact, patriotic. One found a hundred proofs of a plan for a formidable attack through Rumania and Hungary against the Reich. Another found a hundred proofs that it was planned to stand to the death on the "Stalin Line". So, in total, two hundred proofs were found that the USSR did not plan to transfer its potential [to Hitler! So the "pact" is a maneuver in the "Great War".

AMATEUR INQUIRIES And who, in fact, is right: Rezun or anti-resunists?

That is, there was a plan of attack or defense? So this is a question from the category: "Is it red or is it square?"

Strictly speaking, countries with their general staffs should be divided not by whether they have plans—offensive or defensive—but, oddly enough, only by the size of the country itself. "State - non-state".

The General Staff of the State is obliged to plan, calculate, work out simultaneously all strategic options. And the defense in the general staffs of all European powers was considered as temporary, forced, as preparation for an offensive. Alexey Isaev in Antisuovorov writes:

"...behind the scenes (Rezun) left the question, who had defensive plans? All war plans of the major powers participating in the two world wars of the twentieth century were offensive. Moreover, the offensive nature did not depend on who would be the initiator of the war. For military planning, this was absolutely indifferent; the plans did not consider the issue of the order in which war was declared.

Only the plans of small countries were strictly defensive, the main line of planning in this case was stubborn defense in the hope that powerful allies would crush the opponents who attacked their country (...)"

Indeed, here is the real, systemic division: Power (large country) - plans to end the war with

61

powerfully (which means offensive). Non-power - plans to defend itself until the matter is decided by the Powers.

Therefore, the General Staff of France had plans for both defense and an offensive against Germany, while, for example, [the General Staff of Belgium — only defense...

And if the dilemma – to fight or go over to the side of the enemy – is resolved: "Fight", then there is nothing fundamentally mutually exclusive in the sets of "attacking" and "defensive" measures.

... But suspicions about the option of the USSR going over to Hitler's side "... Oh, this is so contradictory a ball of truly heroic and unbearably vile, what, really, you think before taking it in your hands.

1. Argument of historians, diplomats: "Always, in all coalitions, all participating states scared each other with the possibility of a separate peace." Playing the card of the threat of a separate peace is more often an element of pressure on the allies, and here it is still very far from the realization of such a step...

2. An objection, for example, from a Leningrader or a Stalingrader of 1942: "Yes, it is generally impossible to live under Hitler's Rug."

3. The argument of the "united European" of 1942 (or 2002): "Well, although we are not Germans, we are still culturally closer, more economically integrable and useful to them. So Hitler found a job for us (that's why the power plants (and the "airbus" plant in Bordeaux!) cannot be blown up, otherwise the quarries in Thuringia shine). And those are the Scythians, they are threatened with complete annihilation, even if they fight to the death."

Of these three, of course, the "pleasant" thing to talk to is the third one.

— Monsieur (Pan), your design bureaus and factories are, of course, wonderful, Renault and Skoda are wonderful cars, but in terms of a purely theoretical comparison of the needs of your former "crisis manager" Adolf, the T-34 tanks were him a much more interesting and necessary thing! Capturing them on the battlefield (this happened, yes, and often), the Germans dismantled and tried to copy them (unsuccessfully) and gave them to their elite crews. And, of course, the Ural factories that produce them, and the Kirov factory (KV-2 tank) would be much more desirable for your Adolf.

62

projects. Not to mention those nameless "numbered" manufacturing plants "Katyusha" and "II-2".

As for racial and cultural closeness as a guarantee against Auschwitz... You know, your Fuhrer was generally a strange, fantastic person. X artist. He asserted that it is possible to comprehend the racial type of any people only by seeing (here he is right) its true representatives - peasants and peasant children. That is why Hitler did not attach decisive importance to the impressions of the Viennese kaleidoscope of his youth (regulars of salons, pubs, "meblirashek"). And he kept repeating phrases like: "The Alsatian peasant is an extremely racially pure being. What the Alsatian peasant thinks and does is extremely important." During the First World War, he fought on the Western Front. That is why he was so shocked (no less than Stalingrad) when he first saw white-headed Russian children near Vinnitsa. "Yes, they are bigger Aryans than we are!" - he confessed to his comrades-in-arms with pressure. True (the Fuhrer is the Fuhrer!), having studied this issue with all the meticulousness, he nevertheless found that "by [4 years old, the Aryan type nevertheless emerges more strongly in

German children.

That is, the Russian children's team won the "Aryan Championship", while the youth team lost (under the sole refereeing of the Fuhrer). So your whimsical Fuhrer could instantly and in the most striking way change the "rating" of any European ... contingent.

However, no, he also had one indelible "racial impression" taken out of school. In Table Talk, he recalls: "In our class, little Czechs were crying—on the day the news of the fall of Port Arthur came. And since then I have fallen in love with Japan!"

An interesting psychological sketch. The brat, he didn't know anything about Russia either, but he fell in love with Japan – not as the conqueror of Port Arthur, but as the punisher of the "little Czechs" who beat him at school. And then an important conclusion - to the outstretched ears of the "table" generals surrounding him: "The Czechs will always hope for" mother Russia!

If only!.. In 1938!

AMATEUR INQUIRIES But after all, Rezun writes in Icebreaker not only about the Stalinist plan of attack in 1941, but also ...?

63

Yes Yes. Exactly ... Rezun also writes that Stalin almost himself seated Hitler in the chancellor's chair. But this is already a completely "special article". And the Icebreaker, and all other military

Rezun's political texts definitely fall into two parts, relatively speaking, military and political. And this is not a play on words. The watershed line is so objective, can be traced even in the very texture of the text, as if under one "Label" they tried to "solder" completely dissimilar materials: steel and plywood, for example. "Military" Rezun, "the soul is empty, the brain is full of numbers of divisions", in general, is quite adequate to one narrow topic: the proof that Stalin in 1941 planned to attack (or counterattack?) Hitler. Here he (Rezun) is a tireless weaver, and his canvas, his own network of evidence is strong. Hundreds, thousands of examples, some of his warehouses of cowhide boots on the border in the 68th and 41st are worth something! Here are all his "division numbers in the brain." But the "political" Rezun, who is trying to blame Stalin for Hitler's rise to power, is not a dense fabric, but a pair of white rotten threads. It is wild and ridiculous to build an "evidence base" on Trotsky's quote: "Oh, if there were no Stalin, there would be no Hitler, there would be no Gestapo!" Yes, even if it was Rezun the schoolboy who wrote the essay, he could be scolded: "There are quotations of proof, but there are quotations - like sighs."

Here is the shortest quote from the chief of the German General Staff, Halder: "...but the Fuhrer's continental thinking..." is indirect, completely unexpected evidence. This is a quote-proof... It was about many variants of the colonies offered to Hitler, so to speak, "African and Asian Munich ideas". And Halder sighs that the Fuhrer's continental thinking did not allow him to seriously even consider such proposals. All thoughts are about the continent, about Eurasia, that is, about the Soviet territories. Wars in the West are only the necessary support [of the Main War, in the East...

I must confess: I added the word "Ah" to "Rezun's basic quote from Trotsky" myself, to complete the picture. As if in Rezunov's "Icebreaker" stood - Trotsky: "If there were Stalin, there would be no Hitler, there would be no

64

Gestapo! But even so it is clear that this is Trotsky's type of sigh. Husband to a hateful wife: "Ah! If not for you, I could become a professor, an academician!" And vice versa: "Oh, if not for you, I could marry ... a millionaire!" Trotsky even has this addendum with the first everyday detail that comes across: "...there would be no Gestapo!" — confirms the psychological drawing. Why Gestapo? Not SS, not SD?.. And it's like: "... ah! neither you nor your ... dirty socks!

Why do I have the right to transfer the discussion of Rezun's argument into such an anecdotal-everyday sphere? Yes, therefore, Rezun positions himself as the main person who is aware (about the rise of [Hitler to power]) - Trotsky, who lost his state post, chairman of the Revolutionary Council, in 1924, expelled from the country in 1929! Building a base on such emotional "oh, if only" of a wife expelled to Mexico (or a "political prostitute" - according to another well-known definition) is simply bad form. And the entire political part of Rezunov (check it! After all, this is, in fact, an amazing "evidence base"!) is a few more of the same quotes from Trotsky in 1936, 1938 and 1939.

"Stalin finally untied the hands of Hitler, as well as his opponents, and pushed Europe to war" (November 1938). "The USSR will move with its whole mass to the borders of Germany just at the moment when the Third Reich will be involved in the struggle for the redivision of the world" (June 1939). And all these "most secret information", all these "hot reports" are from the homeland of tequila, where Trotsky has been sitting for 15 years as a retired Trotsky ...

And I would advise our historians: Rezun really tirelessly rummages through the military archives, sensitively finds facts that are out of sight of many, and deftly presents them. It must be admitted that he, Rezun, figuratively speaking, brought a whole new army of readers to the fields of the former battles of World War II. Let his "historical" books not compete with the serious works of the same Isaev. He is among Coelho, Dan Brown, Dontsova, Koretsky, Tolkien. That is, it manifests itself at the moment when a person chooses to read: about bandits, alchemists, prostitutes of artists - or "about the war".

So, we just need a different model for using Rezun. Let me give you a well-known example. A man releases a pig into a truffle field, the pig first searches, then tears off

65

truffles, but that's where her "collaboration" ends. A person finds another use for the truffle, different from the desires of his grunting "employee".

ABOUT THE REAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF HITLER'S COMING TO POWER

If we are involved in the emergence of a new Big Enemy in Europe (with unsuccessful instructions to the German communists), then it is, as it were, at the philosophical level of "the interconnectedness of all things" and approximately to the same extent as Poland, Mexico, Malta, Tibet, Guadeloupe...

"The arrival of [Hitler]" is three steps, approximately equal in value:

- 1) the success of the NSDAP in the parliamentary elections;
- 2) appointment by President Hindenburg on January 30, 1933 [of Hitler as chancellor;
- 3) the death of Hindenburg on August 2, 1934, and the decision a few days earlier that, in the event of this death, the chancellor would become president.

And then Hitler carried out another state casting: while retaining the post of chancellor, he appropriated the title of Fuhrer to himself, and canceled the post of Reich President. And he introduced a provision that all army officers without exception were required to swear allegiance, but not to the constitution, but to the Fuhrer, that is, personally to Adolf Hitler.

Now back to those three steps up.

1. In the parliamentary elections, indeed, Hitler was helped by the unwillingness of the socialists and communists to unite. Rezun here for a long time procrastinates the name of the communist Remmele, about whom, finally, it turns out only that "he was an ardent admirer of Stalin." Nightmare revelation. But after all, even throughout Europe, the socialists very difficultly and rarely converged with the communists. This is how they are created and conceived, and they have different Internationals (Second and Third).

2. It must not be forgotten that President Hindenburg appointed the chancellor in the same way—sometimes in accordance with parliamentary arrangements, and sometimes not. Only in 1932 did he, [in

66

Denburg, on March 28, appointed Heinrich Brüning Chancellor, who formed the government and resigned on May 30 (at the request of Hindenburg; in what follows, for brevity, we will write "dismissed by Hindenburg").

Next, | Franz von Papen was appointed chancellor on June 17, and was dismissed on November 17. Further, on December 3, von Schleicher was appointed - dismissed on January 30, 1933. Hitler was next.

So it is not serious to absolutize the point of Hitler's appointment as chancellor. In various debates, when I hear this "became chancellor", I always try to politely add - "fifth for year".

Here Hindenburg was an absolute and indisputable figure in Germany - and why did he become one? Here is an example for you at the level of "relationship of everything that exists": the Russians really made Hindenburg such a, mmm... "quasi-Kaiser" (forgive me this term), because they allowed themselves to be defeated near Tannenberg. This victory of the Hindenburg in 1914 (and practically on the site of the historical Grunwald, where 500 years earlier the Teutons were defeated by the Polish

Lithuanian-Russian army) saved Germany and gave it such authority and glory that ... But if you unwind further, then Hindenburg won because the Russians, not having mobilized and in violation of all plans, threw forward and alone the armies of Rennenkampf and Samsonov — at the passionate French pleas, saving Paris and partly saving it (the Germans transferred troops to East Prussia, which they did not have enough to implement the Schlieffen plan) ... Here they are - the true lines of force of interconnections in world history.

BUT, even just to imagine Hindenburg consulting with Stalin on the appointment of his chancellors - this ... this must retreat for a thousand years, rewrite and distort the entire world history, the entire chronology, call Fomenko with Nosovsky - and you probably can't imagine that.

This is what Hitler fundamentally differed from all three previous chancellors of 1932, as he had his own army, even two: Ernst Röhm's SA detachments (this is almost completely his own guard) and the Steel Helmet detachments (reichswehr veterans, "master - Alfred Hugenberg, capitalist, one of the richest people in Germany).

A feature of the political life of Germany in those years was that many parties had their own semi-combat detachments. And the communists

67

and even socialists (yes, yes, they, by the way, had "green shirts"). Such was, in modern terms, the "dress code"... By the way, Hitler's well-known phrase: "Ato the boss on the street is the boss in Germany" - this is exactly about that "romanticism" of street fights, breakdowns of strangers and protection of their rallies. So, Hitler became the "master on the street" when the SA multimillionaire Hugenberg agreed to join his "brown shirts" with his "steel helmets". This happened around the same time that ex-Chancellor Papen, together with Thyssen and Krupp, asked Hindenburg for Hitler.

The Communists (even if they are recognized as 200% Stalinists) were the furthest from these combinations, moreover, they were the target and the main victim of the parties negotiating in the Hindenburg's waiting room.

The book "Daily Life in Berlin under Hitler", authored by Jean Marabini, is good precisely because of its "non-dissertation". There is no cross-cutting theory in it, but there are several hundred Microtestimonies of politicians and "little people", diplomats and correspondents of Western newspapers in Germany. The author seemed to be walking with a voice recorder through the streets of Berlin in the thirties. And he testifies: in 1932, even German Jews (!) were more afraid of the Communists than of Hitler (German Jews were 90% wealthy people).

An example of real help to Hitler, recognized by historians all over the world, is his actual rescue by the "Munich" at the moment of the most real threat of losing power...

Military cooperation between the USSR and Germany (another Rezunov point)? But this is just the 20s. With the advent of Hitler, the intensity of joint work decreased. After the "Pact", of course, on the contrary, it increased significantly, but this is already different, this is a maneuver that has the right to undertake the "Great War", the real components of which at that time were: Spain, Hasan, and Khalkhin Gol.

To be honest, the previous two pages of the book made me a little uncomfortable. It is embarrassing to state such banal truths. But still, in conclusion, for those, for example, who at this moment have read only ... Rezun and Dan Brown. And such an informed historian as Churchill, who wrote his memoirs during the period of the most cruel confrontation with the USSR, never once accused Stalin of having Hitler come to power.

68

I repeat that, in the broadest sense, the situation in Germany was influenced not only by the USSR, but also by the State of Fecia, Tibet, Mexico, Honduras, Malta... The whole world... And... Sweden, quiet Sweden. Let's take a look at this example as well.

SWEDEN, QUIET SWEDEN

One fact is usually repeated in Swedish-Hitler relations: Swedish iron ore. Yes, Kiruna ore was the basis of German metallurgy. The Germans, who so adored the epithet "steel", steel - by origin - had Swedish. And if we trace that difficult path with some "tagged atom", it turns out that the fragments and bullets that war veterans in Russia, Britain, and the USA still carry in themselves, used to lie under a mountain ... far, far away, in the very north of Sweden.

It can be said that they sold ore, business is business. It can be said that they paid off with uninterrupted supplies from a possible invasion by Hitler. The Fuhrer had such a plan - the development of the same General Falkenhorst, the conqueror of Norway and Denmark. And it did not materialize, perhaps due to "not seeking good from good". Now the ore is coming - pah-pah! — and in the event of capture... both sabotage by the Resistance and British bombing are possible. Look at the map: the exit from Kiruna is one thin thread of the only railway. This is not the dense network of German roads, which, no matter how bombed, worked until May 1945. Kiruna could be cut off with a single air raid. But... the Swedish "neutrality" turned out to be the best anti-aircraft defense of the Reich's supply routes.

And if we move from the material, material world (even if it is such a material beloved by the Nazis as becoming), it turns out that in the world of ideas, Sweden was connected with Germany.

The great traveler, scientist and writer Sven Anders Tedin is one of Hitler's main idols. Moreover, a truly noble man, he wished peace to Europe and, like many, considered the Fuhrer a true peacemaker. He openly repeated that he himself was a quarter Jew. In addition, he was a great friend of Russia. (And here Rezun could expose "in an icebreaker way": the USSR and Hitler "were friends through Hedin ... and on

69

sure ... we agreed.") The Reich Chancellor in all the years was glad to talk for a long time with the Swede. It was Sven Gedin who opened the 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin.

Hermann Goering saw the swastika for the first time in his life in Sweden at the von Rosenow castle. The first institute of racial biology in Europe was opened in 1921 in "Swedish Oxford", Uppsala, and it was a project of the then ruling Social Democratic Party. Another of the Swedish analogues, or even anticipations, the antecedents of similar measures in Germany: a general account of the Jews of Sweden. But those lists were not needed... It turns out that ore, iron ore, saved the Swedish Jews... Yes, here's another example of "the interconnection and mutual influence of all things." In Sweden, detachments of the "Northern Youth" - "Nordisk Ungdum" were also created, and also earlier than the Hitler Youth. By the way, Ingvar Kamprad also marched in the Northern Youth, later the founder of the IKEA worldwide network ("I have an idea!").

According to the journalist Bosse Schon, 500 Swedish volunteers fought in the SS, in the Viking and Norland divisions. The privates there received 311 crowns per month, sergeants - 563 crowns, the captain - 1200. The average salary then in Sweden was 270 crowns. One of these Swedish SS men was even a witness at the wedding of Adolf Hitler and Eva Braun. And, concluding with the marriage theme, let us also remember Goering, who met in Sweden the "love of life" Karina von Kantzow...

This is Sweden. It could be written, in modern terms, as "associated members" of the United (by Tytler) Europe. Maybe it will seem to someone that the facts of her complicity in the "fascist project" are somehow mounted, reduced for exaggeration, "protrusion" of her, Swedish, share of guilt and responsibility. No, I repeat, the whole point of this book is to point out just the similarity of situations in all (except Britain and the USSR) countries of Europe and the complete similarity

the decisions they made. "We value and protect our material culture. We are not fanatics. Someone else will have to donate their property and set us free."

So take it as evidence "from the contrary": the author does not intend to "push out the complicity" of quiet, quiet Sweden, so that behind this "bloated example" ... some kind of "quiet, quiet Holland" is not hidden ...

70

And here, by the way, is an example of "Dutch complicity", which turned up quite by accident, without any purposeful "search for evidence".

One of the heaviest air battles of 1944 in the Baltic. German aviation, based mainly in Kotka (Finland), keeps our fleet in the Gulf of Finland locked up like in a bottle. (In general, the neutralization of significant naval forces exclusively by aviation is one of the main German "know-how" of that war.) Our pilots have been trying to break this blockade for a long time, and in long air battles, the main stronghold covering the Luftwaffe bases is revealed: an air defense cruiser "Niobe". 7 of our air regiments, 132 aircraft were thrown into the decisive battle. As a result, the Niobe was nevertheless sunk, the Luftwaffe was thrown back from the Gulf of Finland. Two of our pilots received the Hero of the Soviet Union that day. And at the end of the dramatic description, our author briefly mentions that the famous Niobe is the former Dutch cruiser Gelderland...

And how many such examples of the real complicity of the "United Europe" can certainly be found in the annals of the Second World War!

The Dutch history of the war mentions the attempts to defend themselves, crossed out by the "brutal bombardment of Rotterdam". There is also the phrase "but the forces turned out to be too unequal", which, combined with the fact that Hitler, attacking Belgium and France, allocated only 16,000 soldiers to Holland, certainly leaves an interesting impression.

In fairness, it must be said, summing up the topic of "influence", that Rezun has not yet spoken out on it to the end. "How Stalin created Hitler, how he helped him seize power and strengthen himself is a separate big topic. I am preparing a book on this subject," he writes. That is, there will be "more quotes." True, he has not been able to fulfill this promise for almost 15 years. Has Trotsky's Mexican pronouncements come to an end? What do you recommend here? Is it really ... the film was recently released - "Frida". About the famous artist, Mexican revolutionary, girlfriend and lover of Leon Trotsky — Frida Kahlo. If, in the disclosure of the theme of [Hitler's coming to power

become so important

71

political reviews "Looking from Mexico" (similar to how the BBC has a program "Looking from London"). Maybe look for supporting quotes in the film? The action takes place there precisely in 1939-1940, during which time Trotsky's testimonies were already so successfully used in Icebreakers. Maybe Frida Kahlo will add something like: "Oh, if not for Stalin, my Levik would have been a purely second Lenin! The second Napoleon!" Frida, like Trotsky at that time, was "in the thick of historical, revolutionary events", but more importantly, Frida Kahlo today is a very "hyped" person (maybe more than Trotsky), Salma Hayek herself plays her in the film! (And they dreamed of playing it, even begged the director of the film, Madonna and Jennifer Lopez about it!) For a pop book, it will be just in the top ten, any advertiser and PR person will confirm this. When the cover will be: "Sensational news about the secret causes of the Second World War! As Frida Kahlo said, Trotsky said that it was Stalin who incited Hitler!

And the preface to the Icebreaker was written by Bukovsky, if you remember this one. Equated with Luis Corvolan during one barter operation, and then even more elevated by the cumulative Western PR, to fantastic quotes, he will surely explain to Rezun all the importance

"information occasions", the importance of any bindings to big names, USHR-persons. At least in this form: "The latest revelations of Jennifer Lopez! The famous megastar claims: "Frida Kahlo, whose secret diaries I read when I was about to play her role in the blockbuster of the same name, testifies irrefutably: Hitler was just a pawn in the cunning hands of Stalin!"

TWO WWII HISTORIANS (BUKOVSKY AND REZUN)

Some chapters of my book are supplemented by portraits of the persons mentioned. And as I got closer to the end of this chapter, a certain painful feeling grew in me. It seems that's what's going on here. The duty of a historian or, say, a pamphleteer, is to push the subject to the limit. Having refuted the version, which seems to me false, it seems to be necessary to say about the authors as well. Biographical and psychological background and all that...

72

And now, mentally going through some facts, arguments, you suddenly realize the complete hopelessness, the impossibility of conducting any dispute, describing the features of these people. (The visual image of this effort is like an attempt to cut through a puddle with a whip.) You understand that the point is precisely in the absence of real Persons. Before you is just... talking (slurping) mud... Let me explain, by the way, why we are talking about both the author of The Icebreaker and the author of the preface to The Icebreaker. It seems that things are incomparable, even in terms of volume. But such an idea just comes from real books, with real authors, with real arguments, with real topics for debate.

Here, however, there is complete hopelessness in that everything is obscured by these formless and dimensionless (and meaningless) definitions: "dissident", "victim of the regime". And it becomes completely unimportant who fled, who was bartered, who wrote the book (1000 pages), who is just a preface (5 pages).

But nevertheless (we will have to) plunge ... let's say, in Bukovsky:

"It's funny to remember now, but in those distant years, anti-communism, and simply a negative attitude towards the Soviet Union, was like a bad disease in the eyes of the Western intelligentsia, and an honest everyday writer of hardened socialism could not count not only on the recognition of his talent, but simply for a review. Only a few of us had by that time succeeded in making a breach in wall of silence.

It was even more difficult for Victor than for us. After all, some left-wing scum even dared to hint to me in one television dispute that, they say, "some people" can regard my views as "a betrayal of their country". But that was once, and with my biography, it was easy for me to get rid of that dirty trick. From the very beginning, he had to live with this senseless stigma ... "

And moving from "pitiful" to Bukovsky "logic" ...

..The victory of the revolution in Russia was, in the words of Lenin, "less than half the battle." For this victory to become final and irrevocable, "we must achieve the victory of the proletarian revolution in all, or at least in several of the main capitalist countries." Without their industrial potential there was nothing to think about socialism. Hence the Leninist NEP, and new tactics

73

"the siege of the capitalist citadel", the use of their contradictions to hasten the advent of the world revolution, that is, the beginning of the world war. Stalin in this sense was only a faithful disciple of Marx-Lenin.

I can explain. The whole, absolutely the whole Rezun's logical chain boils down to the following. Take something indisputable, banal, well, like \$1 \15 raset — Beyit raga (If you want peace, prepare for war). And then the chain continues: Was Stalin preparing for war? And how! (Further - 130 pages of solid, in general, evidence.) "So, it means that he also appointed Hitler to the chancellors of Germany - so that he had someone to fight with!" (and more about this on the pages, those with "fresh" quotes from Trotsky of the 1939 model).

So Bukovsky: "Stalin – a faithful disciple of Marx Lenin? Yes! Does Marx have a thesis about the inevitability of world revolution? Yes! And the world revolution is, in fact, a world war? Right. Well, then, Stalin and ... "

For such syllogisms, indeed, 150 pages and two paragraphs are equally sufficient. But after that, Vova needs to explain to the reader why in the real books of real historians (Churchill, for example) there is no trace of such "logic on the fingers." A little more Bukovsky:

"In a word, it is clear that our domestic historians could not in any way recognize the facts presented in this book without recognizing the natural aggressiveness of communism and its responsibility in a crime against humanity on a par with Hitlerism. But what prevented Western historians from noticing such an obvious truth?

Yes, exactly the same as their Soviet counterparts: conformism. After all, even here, in the West, there are powerful political forces that are capable of making deeply unhappy any wise guy who comes out with revelations they don't like. To admit, following the well-known anecdote, that Hitler was just a "petty tyrant of the Stalin era", the local establishment is still not ready, and until recently the author of such a theory would have been ostracized as a "fascist". Such a daredevil could never make a career, become a professor, or even publish a book. That is why in the West there were a little more people who decided to openly declare themselves anti-communists than in the former USSR."

74

Just imagine: "Churchill is a conformist"! In fact, it is difficult even to imagine anything more incompatible. (Sort of, mm... "Kolobok Rezun ran not from the GRU, but from the Bolshoi Ballet.") The most talented and, of course, certainly the most informed chronicler, Churchill was a minister even before receiving the post of prime minister in 1940. And, what is significant, he writes his history not at the moment of friendship-alliance with Stalin, between Tehran and Yalta, but at the very height of the "cold war" with the USSR, partly declared by him. And even close, Churchill does not consider Stalin (or the German communists) to be the culprit of Hitler's coming to power. So, in Bukowski: Churchill is a "conformist"!

And in everything in Bukovsky, the logic of a person who received a position at Cambridge precisely "for pure dissidence" is very noticeable. Who is well aware of the vulnerability of his position: both the "barter deal: Korvalan-Bukovsky" and his "feeding" in Cambridge are just the smallest curls of a large historical pattern. Well, he came up with a random living illustration to some keynote report "on the communist threat and the need to support dissidence"... but everything can change in one minute...

"After all, even here, in the West, there are powerful political forces that are capable of making deeply unhappy any wise guy who comes out with revelations they don't like.

Here is the image chosen by Bukovsky for himself: a clever man who can be made deeply unhappy, a sort of... Akaky Akakievich Goebbels.

And another historian Vova, who littered a certain part of the shelves of our book stalls, recently undertook a new marketing ploy on his approximately 15-16th book: "I take my words back!" I had to, I looked in, read a few pages - it looks like yes: Rezun will really sell the next 10-15 books under the sauce of partial self-refutations. He has already apologized to Marshal Zhukov. But on the most important (in my opinion) topic of his "icebreaking"

exaggerations: Hitler against Stalin (and in fact - throwing the responsibility for the Second World War on the USSR) - there are no self-denials here ...

75

In general, this is amusing: the new Judas does not hang himself, but only diligently adds 31-35th pieces of silver to the 31 for his "Memories of the Garden of Gethsemane". And then another 36th-40th piece of silver for "Amendments to the memories of ... I take my words back!". |

And any conversation will inevitably move into this plane, according to the law of the spreading of a semi-liquid substance. Therefore, we will finish with the "Vovchik-historians". And let's move on to the historian - from self-real.

Chapter 8: TOO MANY CHURCHILLS

It is no longer known which of the journalists launched this slogan, but in 1915 it was picked up by many British newspapers. Minister of the Navy in 1911-1915, Churchill had a lot of merit for the country (including the energetic transition of the fleet from coal to oil), but in January 1915 he got involved in a long landing operation off the Dardanelles.

It seems that the Russians were confidently crushing the Turks in the Caucasus, and no one expected that the British landing on the Gallipoli peninsula, near the Dardanelles, would be so hard and successfully blocked by Turkish troops. Churchill then began feverishly and furiously, how shall I put it... to pull the entire British "military and economic blanket" to the Dardanelles, intercepting reserves from the main fronts, forgetting that this whole operation was "launched" as a small and just distracting. He quarreled with dozens of naval and land commanders, officials and government colleagues. Knocking out new contingents, he "raised the stakes" and, in the end, nevertheless turned an offensive, but private defeat into ... a major British fiasco. At that time, this slogan appeared in the newspapers: "Too much Churchill!" In the original language, it probably sounded like this: "Too tis SpigsVI!" Sir Winston had to resign. It seems that Lloyd George then elegantly noted "Churchill's organic incapacity to hold any post other than Prime Minister."

76

Churchill was known to us for a long time by Lenin's definition: "The worst hater of the Soviet regime." He could have ended up on these pages in another, somewhere even opposite capacity, for example, as the husband of the order-bearer (so, it seems?) Clementine. His wife, Clementine Churchill, president of the Russian Relief Fund, was awarded the Order of the Red Banner of Labor. (I'm still trying to imagine this order with the famous cogwheel and the red banner on Lady Clementine's chest.) He could also be mentioned as the head of state, the first (since June 22, 1941) ally of the USSR in World War II. Or as an outstanding historian, laureate of the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1953.

But in accordance with the paradoxical needs of my genre, the pamphlet, the elephant Churchill will appear here as a continuation and development of the theory, the syllogism of the microbe — Vova Bukovsky.

In "Monument to Human Blindness", as well as in "Icebreaker" (to which it is the preface), both Vovas (Bukovsky and Rezun "prefaced" by him) accused Stalin and the USSR of Hitler's rise to power. - they explained the opinions of others, including Western historians, by what hinders them ...

— ... Yes, exactly the same as their Soviet counterparts: conformism. After all, even here, in the West, there are powerful political forces that are capable of making any wise guy deeply unhappy... and then see the previous chapter.

And Churchill (Winston Lenard Spencer, Duke of Marlborough, 1874-1965) also does not consider Stalin and the USSR to be the culprits of Hitlerism - not in the least. Hence, he is also a conformist! From this

places to write this pamphlet has become really more fun. The comic effect is undeniable. After all, to tell the truth, it is to Sir Winston that one more Leninist definition, memorized by all the schoolchildren of the Soviet Union, can be applied: "What a block! What a seasoned man!"

Yes, it is Tolstoy and Churchill that can be called, among other things, "the greatest nonconformists of the 19th and 20th centuries"! For some, the very possibility of comparing the figures of Leo Tolstoy and Churchill will seem like a joke, immeasurably original, but I am ready to make every effort to point out the real points and lines of similarity and, most importantly, to document

77

to express the productivity, the objective usefulness of this comparison, which is similar to the paired biographies of the great Greeks and Romans by Plutarch.

CHURCHILL AND TOLSTOY

Let's start with the dotted line - the common Dash of the outermost property. Both are representatives of ancient families, bearers of feudal titles. Both lost their fathers early, but received a good supply of long-term physical health. Both at the age of 26 went to their campaigns (Crimean and Boer wars) as volunteers and as writers (correspondents for *Sovremennik* and *Morning Post*, respectively).

And it must be admitted that the fact of Churchill's transition in 1904 from the Conservatives to the Liberal Party, and in 1923 again to the Conservatives, was both for a descendant of the Duke of Marlborough, and for a politician of his stature, as incredible as if he really walked down Downing street with a cigar and ... barefoot. This complete independence from one's own class, from the dictates of one's corporations (politicians, writers, historians) and, most importantly, absolute independence from contemporary conventions and mental clichés — this is what unites Sir Winston and Count Tolstoy.

And if only you are able to correctly understand what non-conformism is in these conditions, you will certainly recognize Sir Winston as the greatest British non-conformist, who issued such pearls as:

The best argument against democracy is a five-minute conversation with the average voter. (This is in a country where almost the main pride is a centuries-old electoral system.)

He had all the virtues that I hate and not a single vice that I admire. (Also not weak in a society of conservative and Puritan traditions.)

A fanatic is a person who cannot change his views and cannot change the subject. (Very possibly.)

And let one of them accept the Nobel Prize, and for several years the "Nobel committee members" probed the position of the other through relatives ("Won't he send?" - about

78

the predicted refusal of the most famous writer in the world could seriously damage, as they believed, the prestige of the newly established prize. Then subtle intrigues were drawn up, according to the count, the award should still be accepted. But without success), the main thing is their freedom and independence in judgments and in literary creations.

Endowed with a huge supply of vitality, they had a very similar attitude towards medicine. And the famous Tolstoy: "...despite the fact that Prince MM was treated by doctors, he recovered." And Churchill's: "In my youth, I made it a rule not to drink a drop of alcohol before dinner. Now that I'm no longer young, I stick to the rule not to drink a drop of alcohol before breakfast", "At my age, I can no longer afford to feel bad."

But what, in fact, can the author say about such well-known personalities, and where is the announced productivity of their comparison?

Take the most important of the topics discussed: the causes of the Second World War. Churchill, in his book "The Second World War" (Spigsell \ .. \$. Tne Zesopa \ No. na W/ag. Gondop, 1951) does not tire us readers (just as he did not tire himself, the writer), with especially detailed statistical or archival research. (It's scary to imagine what volumes of tables of steel and coal production, graphs of unemployment growth, armaments, population, tonnage of battleships, etc. can surround this topic.) The routine that historians-handicraftsmen were engaged in, after all, Leo Tolstoy despised it extraordinarily. Remember how he, Lev Nikolaevich, expressed the essence of their (scientific artisans) work: first they diligently copy from books into notebooks, and then they make up their own book from these notebooks.

The main thing in which they, Tolstoy and Churchill, found application for their abilities was in the search for that angle of view from which these slag heaps of facts had not yet been considered before them. In principle, it is clear that the work of the original historian Leo Tolstoy is obscured by the brilliant creations of Tolstoy the writer, but the originality of the historian Churchill also often eludes us.

Here is what he puts on his list of the most important causes of World War II:

79

"What was imposed on the Germans was the ideal that the liberals of the West aspired to... The prejudice of the Americans against the monarchy made it clear to the defeated empire (Germany in 1918) that, as a republic, it could expect to be better treated by allies than as a monarchy. If we had pursued a wise policy, we would have crowned and strengthened the Weimar Republic with a constitutional monarch in the person of the young grandson of the Kaiser, placing a regency council over him. Instead, a gaping void formed in the national life of the German people. All the strong elements, military and feudal, that could have united in support of the constitutional monarchy ... were thrown out of the rut. The Weimar Republic, with all its virtues and ideals, was seen as something imposed by the enemy... failed to win the allegiance and capture the imagination of the German people."

Rate it. This is not a discovery from archival or statistical excavations; England in the 1960s was very dependent on the support of the United States, but this does not prevent Churchill from seeing (and showing others, all readers of his memoirs) the primitiveness and limitations of the American view of history and the world order. These are the roots of current American political correctness: in any country at any time, without a monarch (or dictator), it will certainly be more beautiful, decent and comfortable than with it.

And what if that Churchillian thought had visited in 2003, for example, his "colleague" — the British Prime Minister Tony Blair? And he, in addition, would have been able, with Churchill's stubbornness, to convey it to George W. Bush: "You should not build a "Weimar Republic" in Iraq. England will not participate in this." Maybe there would have been no London bombings.

True, the Americans always have a "bad investigator" in their kit for a "good investigator". And to the Princeton idealist professor, he is a stern realist, with another, also well-known geopolitical postulate: "about our son of a bitch." But, unfortunately, the German Kaiser was not "their son of a bitch", which means, forward to the forefront - liberals! "Long live the Weimar Republic!" And so it went...

80

And so on — the whole history of interwar Europe was analyzed by Churchill "step by step". And what is interesting in his approach is that for each step towards war, Churchill identifies the main culprits -

from among the great powers.

— Renunciation of the USA from the guarantees of the inviolability of the borders promised to France.

- Withdrawal of French troops from the Rhineland.

— Program of American loans to Germany.

— The introduction of military service by Germany.

- The entry of the Wehrmacht into the Rhineland left by France.

- The assassination of the Austrian chancellor Dollfuss.

- Mussolini's attack on Ethiopia.

- Anschluss of Austria.

- In fact, a separate naval agreement between England and Germany - "Munich".

And everywhere at the top of this "German pandering hit parade", the list of the main responsible looks something like this:

1. USA, 2. England, 3. France;

. France, 2. England, 3. USA; . USA, 2. England, 3. France; . England, 2. Italy, 3. France; . France, 2. England, 3. USA; , Italy, 2. England, 3. France; . England, 2. France, 3. Italy; . England, 2. France, 3. Italy.

rey ry times rysh ryshyf - rysh rishi

And so on. And never - the USSR Our country appears in this period of history in general very rarely. Very many people — after all, we, compatriots, have such a dash — will, on the contrary, be unpleasant and even insulting such our "non-presence" in the "grand European events". But here you just need to remind yourself that only the ambitions of fascist Germany were "grand" then, and the rest of Europe slid into the Second World War, like a miserable, decrepit old woman who, no one knows how, ended up on an icy hill.

So, the Soviet Union appears in pre-war history:

(1) The first detailed mention of the actions of the USSR meeting

Churchill only has it on the 87th page of his book. It is clear, dear readers, that this (page number) is not all God

81

what an indicator, even if we report for comparison that the whole story from the end of the First World War to "Munich" in Churchill's memoirs of the Harvest edition is 170 pages.

A more reliable reference to this first mention of the USSR would be the date:

May 2, 1935. The French government signed the Franco-Soviet Pact, and soon the French minister Laval visited Moscow. It was then that those negotiations took place, a fragment of which (more precisely, an incomparable anecdote) was first published just in Churchill's memoirs. See Chapter 1. Today it is more often repeated in the context: "W.W.'s sense of humor. Stalin." And after this colorful fragment, with the same Stalinist one: "And how many divisions does the Pope have?"... Churchill continues:

"Laval had no intention of binding France with any of the precise obligations that the Soviets are in the habit of insisting on. And yet he succeeded in having [May 5 (1935)] published Stalin's statement - the approval of France's national defense policy, with the aim of maintaining its armed forces at a certain level. As a factor in European security, the Franco-Soviet Pact... was of limited value. France did not achieve a real alliance with Russia. In addition, on the way back, Laval stopped in Krakow. There, at the funeral of Marshal Pilsudski, he met Goering, with whom he had a cordial conversation. Laval's statements, expressing distrust and hostility towards the Soviets, were timely brought to the attention of Moscow through German channels ... "

(2)

The second time when the USSR appears (in Churchill's "History ...") as an actor, and now even as one of the leaders of Europe, is the war in Spain. The Soviet Union is so boldly and effectively opposing Germany and Italy there that France, for the first time, takes several decisive steps after it, venturing to provide aviation to the Spanish Republicans. But England proclaims neutrality and immediately, including through the mouth of Churchill, shouts out to France, which is trying to fight fascism for the first time.

82

(3)

Czechoslovakia. Now the manifestations of the role of the USSR will go on increasing. The USSR is trying to unite Europe and save Czechoslovakia. On March 18, we proposed to convene a conference on "ways and means of implementing the Franco-Soviet Pact in the event of a German threat to the peace."

Now Churchill is a fierce supporter of England joining this (Franco-Soviet) pact, previously criticized for being amorphous. But here is the answer of the then British Prime Minister Chamberlain:

"The plan for the 'Grand Alliance', as Sir Winston calls it, crossed my mind ... we submitted this plan to the consideration of the Chiefs of Staff and the experts of the Foreign Office. This is a very attractive idea, and there is much to be said in its defense until you approach it from the point of view of its practical feasibility. One need only look at the map to see that France and we can do nothing to save Czechoslovakia from the German invasion. Therefore, I have abandoned any idea of giving guarantees to Czechoslovakia or France in connection with her obligations to that country." - March 20, 1938.

Reader! This fragment (Churchill's "History...") needs to be carefully looked at in order to understand to what extent idiocy, foolishness can be reached (and at the same time bring the whole of Europe!), while maintaining a completely restrained diplomatic tone . After all, this is only in appearance - the normal reasoning of a normal prime minister of a normal country. But think about it, and what kind of theater of the absurd actually turns out.

"Great offer. Studied. Discussed with the chiefs of staff, and then how they accidentally looked at the map of Europe... Bah! Yes, it turns out to be impossible ... "

And Churchill also does not hide sarcasm:

"The chiefs of staff and experts at the Foreign Office, of course, did not have to strain their intellect much to tell the Prime Minister that the English fleet and the French army really could not be deployed in the mountains of Bohemia, as a barrier between the Czechs and the Germans.

83

Lerov's invading army. It was really clear just by looking at the map..."

But the main thing, in my opinion, in that confession of Chamberlain, recorded by Churchill, is the date. Back on March 20, 1938, he (Chamberlain) actually decided to stay out of the game ... and then for six months, until the "Munich" meeting on September 30, he somehow managed to "keep the intrigue in Europe", encouraged the Czechs, twisted their arms, disarmed them, promising other guarantees in exchange for leaving the Sudeten Frontier, and eventually handed them over, the Czechs, to Hitler, already practically "naked" and morally crushed.

The USSR is trying, through England and France, through the League of Nations, to obtain the consent of Poland or at least Romania (this is already a decent hook) for permission to "military transit".

(4)

And, finally, the "hot summer of 1939", which ended in the famous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and the war.

But now I would like to preface the next portion of quotations with a certain slogan that returns consciousness to the facts of that period of history. "A Short Course in the History of the CPSU (6)" has been declared in our country as if it were an "odious book" and is now being used very cunningly and very stupidly at the same time. As the simplest proof "by contradiction". Let's suppose that it is necessary to prove that <... at some point the USSR was going to do something ...". What is the easiest way to prove this? Open "Short course ...". "See, it says here that the USSR was going to do this?! - Yes! "But this is the same, great and terrible - "Short Course ..."! "And that means that it can be considered absolutely proven that the USSR was going to!"

As a result of such light chatter in the public consciousness of a significant part of the world, the main country that opposed [Hitler (USSR)] was first transferred to the assistants (and not very skillful ones) of Britain and the United States, and then to the assistants (and also not very clever) Nazi Germany. You can, of course, just laugh at the well-known, even very loud fact that, according to the results of polls, almost a third of the "dense" Americans believe that the USSR fought on the side of Hitler in World War II. But there is also another significant part of the audience, more educated, knowing the facts and believing that Germany and the USSR were allies,

84

accomplices, who later, however, quarreled... And today, all the actions of the United States for the (forced) soft destruction of Russia, from the creation of al-Qaeda to the "cordon sanitaire" - everything is based, among other things, on this public opinion.

And most importantly, as it seems to the builders of simplified schemes ("Short course with a minus sign"), they groped for the most vulnerable spot in the foreign policy of the USSR — the summer of 1939. "Pact"... The theme, of course, is bottomless. And in one chapter it is possible to block only one loophole, though trodden through by a whole detachment of falsifiers.

So, lovers of simple proofs: "A Short Course in the History of the CPSU(b)" and the British Prime Minister and historian Churchill are absolutely unanimous in their interpretation and assessment of the events of 1939 (as, indeed, of the entire pre-war period) - minus the assessments of communism and The internal policy of the USSR as assessed—of course, by the above sources—is diametrically opposed. Get a grasp. Churchill:

"The British and French governments made new attempts to negotiate with Soviet Russia. It was decided to send a special representative to Moscow... Instead of Eden, this most important mission was entrusted to Strang... who had no influence whatsoever. The appointment of such a minor person was in fact an insulting step.... The negotiations revolved around the question of the unwillingness of Poland and the Baltic States to be saved by the Soviets from Germany. The discussions continued throughout July, and finally the Soviet government proposed that the negotiations be continued by military delegations... The British government sent Admiral Drax... who, as it turned out, had no written

negotiation. The Russian side was represented by Marshal Voroshilov. The military conference soon failed due to the refusal of Poland and Romania to let the Russian troops through... Now we know that at the same time the Soviet government agreed to the arrival of a German representative in Moscow. Molotov and his subordinates showed amazing examples of duplicity in all respects with both sides...

The next day (August 23) Ribbentrop arrived in Moscow. It is impossible to say to whom he is (the pact, as follows from

85

context) inspired more disgust — Hitler or Stalin. Both realized that this was only a temporary measure... The antagonism between the two empires was deadly... In favor of the Soviets, it must be said that it was vital for the Soviet Union to move as far to the west as possible the initial positions of the German armies.. In their minds, the fiery trail of those catastrophes that their armies suffered in 1914, rushing to the offensive against the Germans, had not yet completed their mobilization, had not yet faded. And now their borders were much further east than during the first war. They needed to occupy the Baltic states and most of Poland by force or deceit before they were attacked. Their policy was guided not only by cold calculation, but also by the harsh realities of the situation (... }".

And in other fragments of his memoirs, Churchill returns to these facts and, admittedly, does not spare black colors, morally evaluating us something like this: "... the Soviets looked with gloating pleasure", "... they hated and despised Western democracy", "...and we considered them prudent egoists". The title of a separate chapter devoted to this period is also characteristic: "Soviets and Nemesis". Nemesis, the goddess of revenge, seems to have taken revenge on us for gloating and prudent selfishness.

BUT ... to be a witness to Chamberlain's betrayal of Europe, even if it is thrice malicious, is not at all the same as being an accomplice! And Churchill neatly shares this.

This is what should be the answer to the Baltic hyenas, who are ideologically based on the criticism of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact:

— The British Prime Minister and The Short Course in the History of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks testify: "The USA, Britain and France are guilty of the very fact of the emergence of a powerful fascist Germany. And the USSR, as the threat of war grew, took the necessary (although, as it turned out, insufficient) defense measures.

Evaluate now the next fragment. Churchill:

"... and after two weeks (of hostilities), the Polish army of about two million people ceased to exist. The turn of the Soviets has come.

86

On September 17, the Russian armies surged across the almost undefended eastern border and marched west on a broad front. On September 18 they met with their German partners in Brest-Litovsk. Here, during the last war, the Bolsheviks, in violation of their official agreements with the Western allies, concluded a separate peace with Kaiser Germany and submitted to its rude conditions. Now in Brest-Litovsk, Russian communists were grinning and shaking hands with representatives of Nazi Germany ... "

Undoubtedly, another unique value of Churchill's view is that he is a veteran of both world wars. And in his "History" these passing introductory phrases: "...but in the last war...", "...and in the last war he was a redneck...", "...and in the last war required" is just the main refrain. This is the way of thinking of the wise man, the leading strategist of both world wars. Here he mentions the meeting of Soviet and German troops on September 18, 1939 in Brest-

Litovsk - and, of course, recalls that it was here in 1918, "during the last war", that the Brest Treaty between Russia and Germany was concluded.

Churchill here, if not accusing, then recalls one, of course, "aggravating circumstance", as if concentrating, condensing history, turning Brest-Litovsk into some kind of "simply bewitched" place of Russian-German "conspiracies".

THREE PARAGRAPHS - "ON THE ROLE OF THE HISTORIAN IN THE WORKING STRUCTURE"

It seems to me that the role of history as a field for interethnic dialogues, disputes, and rivalry will only grow. The proof is the most elementary. The total mass of controversy "spilled in the world" is either constant or certainly non-decreasing. The proportion of "ideological elites" leading (voicing) disputes, as well as communication opportunities, is growing. Meanwhile, the number of "polemical platforms" has decreased. Previously, for example, dialogues and disputes between the USSR and the USA were sublimated and pushed into the sphere of political economy. Roughly speaking, the dispute was: who is more right, Marx or Keynes?

87

Just remember how much was discussed, what share of public attention was occupied by that same ... "convergence". It was a complex thing, approximately convergence, one could understand (interestingly, who understood it not approximately?) as a variant of a draw in the Marx-Keynes match. And those who played "to win" fell upon the "convergence" from both sides. You must admit that today the volume of these political and economic disputes is significantly turned up. The "religious platform for disputes" has also been fairly empty for a long time. Also a characteristic moment. At first there were disputes (wars) directly for dogmas. Then the wars, how to say... for the "mass of the flock". (The flock was understood as a kind of pasta. Who will crush it?) Now comme il faut is acceptable - only disputes over the history of religions.

The famous Fukuyamovsky "The End of History" can be understood in such a way that they will stop making history (in order to avoid "nuclear winter"), and will be engaged in its interpretation. And if the share of "historical" disputes and the share of public attention to them is growing, then the former tactics of gloomy denial or silence are absolutely unacceptable.

I also noticed this trend in some reviews: "Well, Adolf Hitler as a trustee of CJSCE Europe is good, right. But the fuss with Churchill, as you know, the worst hater, is in vain. And the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty of 1918 is generally too big a tragic topic. Why drag her into World War II? And the Russians, grinning and shaking hands with representatives of Nazi Germany in the same Brest - in general ...

My approach here boils down to the following theses:

1. Churchill (the British in general) has the right to remind us of the 1918 Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. No matter how many "historical difficulties" you drag in, it is also just a separate peace, a violation of allied treaties.
2. No matter how much they hid, they unlocked it, but there was some addendum to the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact about the dividing line in Poland. Otherwise, the Soviet and German troops would have simply mixed into a mess. And they, as you know, closed very neatly. In the same Brest.
3. Soviet troops crossed the unprotected eastern (Polish) border. Note: on a romantic

88

(or household) level unprotected sounds touching, and as an additional condemnation - the offender. In the world of "real politics" - exactly the opposite! Unprotected - means that no Polish troops were drawn to it. This means that the USSR did not influence the course (and outcome) of the two-week Polish-German war by a hair!

4. After all, our Western ally admits in the end: in favor of the Soviets, it must be said that it was vital for the Soviet Union to move the starting positions of the German armies as far as possible to the west. So the Russian-German handshake in Brest in 1939 is not the capitulation of 1918, but, as it were, a greeting of boxers before a fight. This means that the grain of the future liberation of Poland also lay in it.

Once again I would like to ask you to evaluate all this strictness and thoroughness of Churchill's arrangement of causes and effects - just in one of the most painful questions for us:

a) first: after two weeks (of hostilities), the Polish army of about two million people ceased to exist;

6) and only then: ... the turn of the Soviets came. On September 17, Russian armies surged across the almost undefended eastern border.

So Churchill's criticism of our "Brest" can be fully recognized.

But what is the conclusion from this? It was during the First World War that we behaved... inadequately. They rushed to Austria for the southern Slavs! To Germany (not having mobilized) - to save Paris! Not that "too nobly, in knightly armor, with a tournament spear - to the tank." But that is exactly what is inadequate. Lost. So... Victory requires other preparatory steps.

And now, after this cold calculation of facts and factors, one can find a place for the "moral-heroic". And here there is something to remember: after all, after those two gloomy Brest (1918 and 1939) there was also ... a third Brest!

Yes Yes! The famous heroic Brest Fortress, which lasted longer than the whole of Polyna in 1939! Longer than united England and France in 1940! For a month there were battles,

89

according to modern military terminology, "high intensity", for a few more months, almost until October 1941, focal resistance continued.

EXPERIENCE OF RESTORATION OF THE HISTORICAL PANORAMA

The importance of dialogue with such great historiographers as Churchill becomes especially clear - "in contrast".

TALK OF PROFESSOR PAVEL VECHORKEVICH IN THE NEWSPAPER VEESEROROSHTA

("Kgesgrozrosha", Poland), September 28, 2005

Pavel Vechorkevich is a professor at the Historical Institute of Warsaw University. He specializes in studying the history of Russia and the USSR, military history, as well as the recent history of Poland. Author of numerous books and articles, incl. "The Campaign of 1939" (2001), "Circle of Death. Purge in the Red Army 1937-1939" (2001), "Political History of Poland 1935-1945" (2005).

"We did not want to end up in an alliance with the Third Reich, but landed in an alliance with the equally criminal Soviet Union. And what is even worse, under his absolute dominance. Hitler, on the other hand, never treated his allies the way Stalin treated the countries conquered after World War II. He respected their sovereignty and legal personality, imposing only certain

limitation in foreign policy. Our dependence on Germany, therefore, would be much less than that dependence on the USSR; where we ended up after the war.

We could find a place on the side of the Reich almost as good as Italy, and certainly better than Hungary or Rumania. As a result, we would be in Moscow, where Adolf Hitler, together with Rydz Smigly, would receive a parade of victorious Polish-German troops. The sad association, of course, is the Holocaust. However, if you think about it well, you can come to the conclusion that a quick victory for Germany could mean that it would not have happened at all. Since

90

The Holocaust was largely a consequence of German military defeats.

..The most important role was played by the fatal order of Rydz-Smigly: "Do not fight the Soviets", as well as the fact that the war with the Soviet Union was not officially declared. Although a full-fledged defense of the Eastern Lands was not possible, a symbolic Westerplatte should have been organized there. Create a defensive point that would resist for a long time. I would defend myself to the end, to the last drop of blood. On these lands, Polish Thermopylae were needed to demonstrate to the whole world our rights to these territories.

..Maybe it was Lvov that was supposed to become these Thermopylae. Because there were all conditions for his protection. This should have been done at least so that later Khrushchev and other bastards would not talk about the "Ukrainian city" and so that this argument would not be accepted so easily by the Americans and the British.

The Bolshevik soldiers also did not want to fight and fought very badly. If we had started a war in 1939 only against the Soviets - this is also evidenced by the experience of the Finnish war - we would have coped with this aggression without major problems. On September 17, we would be 150, and maybe even 200 kilometers east of our borders. Such a war would have already taken place on Soviet territory.

Correspondent:

[September 7, after the news of the Bolshevik attack, the president, the government, and soon the commander-in-chief left the territory of Poland. For a long time, Rydz's "escape" was the subject of ridicule. How do you assess the decision of the commander-in-chief?

- Although he left the country later than Mosticki and the government, it should have been done even later. He was offered, and it would have been brilliant, to cross the border with a rifle in his hands, firing back, which would be symbolic, from the Soviet units pursuing him. It would be a beautiful deed, and I think that in this case no one could reproach him.

91

So, the theses of Vechorkevich:

(1) Hitler never treated his allies the way Stalin treated the countries conquered after World War II. He respected their sovereignty and legal personality...

(2) We could find a place on the side of the Reich almost as good as Italy, and certainly better than Hungary or Rumania.

(3) As a result, we would be in Moscow, where Adolf Hitler, together with Rydz-Smigly, would receive the parade of the victorious Polish-German troops.

— Yes, the famous Nobel Prize writer Czesław Miłosz, who declares that the "spirit of the gentry" has become a general Polish spirit, needs to deviate far from this servile "comparative analysis":

(1) whose whip would be heavier?

(2) could a Polish maid take a more honorable place than a Hungarian cook or, for example, than an Italian janitor or a Romanian footman?

And according to Vechorkevich's point (3), we can recall:

"So it was already. With Napoleon we already entered Moscow, there was also the victorious parade of 1812, and the then idol of Vechorkevich's ancestors was very angry with the assistants. He called them, the Poles, the main culprits for the failure of the Moscow campaign (see Memoirs by Caulaincourt). The Poles framed him, with all their hatred for Moscow, they deceived him with the "Polish Cossacks" ...

BUT Hitler is not Napoleon, he would have punished the serfs much more severely.

And about the possible sympathies of "Pan Hitler" (and the hopes of Vechorkevich):

SS Obergruppenführer Erich von dem Bach-Zelewski, former commissioner for combating partisans in the East (recorded testimony before the Nuremberg Tribunal):

"Himmler, in a speech delivered on the eve of the campaign against Russia, called for a reduction in the total number of the Slavic population of Poland and the occupied territories of the USSR by 30 million people. The racial doctrine of National Socialism left no place on earth for peoples deprived of their homeland.

92

soil, to Jews and Gypsies. All of them were subject to total destruction. Further along the "scale of harmfulness" were the Poles - for five centuries the enemies of Germany, whose numbers were to be reduced as much as possible, and statehood should be liquidated. Since the Poles living in Belarus, as a rule, had a higher educational level than Belarusians, they were sometimes appointed elders, burgomasters and members of councils. But the occupiers regarded this as a temporary phenomenon. In January 1943, the head of the SS and police in Belarus, Hoffman, declared: "In every Pole one must see an enemy who is trying to disguise himself. Therefore, where Polish burgomasters still serve in some villages, they must be eliminated as soon as possible (...) "

As one hero of Bulgakov said: "Poplavsky, is everything clear to you?"

But Vechorkevich had other plans for "combat operations":

"...(4) a symbolic Westerplatte should have been organized there... the Polish Thermopylae were needed to demonstrate to the whole world our rights to these territories.

— ... (5) it would be brilliant to cross the border with a rifle in hand, shooting back, which would be symbolically, from the Soviet units pursuing him. That would be a nice move...

Here it is — true picturesqueness, decorativeness of Poland! The Polish historian is busy "producing shots", "constructing a mise-en-scene". "/ it would be genius to cross the border, firing from a rifle. And it would be symbolic - firing back from the pursuing Soviet units.

And could Rydz hold a rifle with one hand, and then wave a saber in the other - it would be even more photogenic!

Then the choir enters ("Polska has not yet perished!"), And here is the corps de ballet...

Just imagine, there is a great historical one. tragedy. Hitler's Germany is growing like a black hole, absorbing all the physical and moral dwarfs. Austria, Czech Republic, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg,

France, the Balkan bunch... The USSR is the only one stopping it, doing it in the only possible way... - and here the director of the Lilliputian theater is nearby, running around, arranging the actors, not even understanding what is happening in the "big world".

Schopenhauer is right, right: "For a lackey there is no hero!"

The only thing is that you can't miss these Vechorkevich's slips: "Even though he (commander-in-chief Rydz. - I.Sh.) left the country

later than Mostitsky and the government..." Let's decode it: it means that the government left earlier (commander-in-chief). This is what this operetta libretto masks. There is a chain of iron historical facts:

The Polish government fled on the night of 16/17 September. Only after that, on the afternoon of the 17th, did the Red Army move!

And what if Germany had taken these unprotected eastern lands, already abandoned by the Polish government, having approached another 400 kilometers to Moscow?! How the world confrontation would develop further is unknown. It is only known that it would not be the Vechorkevich Theater of Lilliputians, the only defender of the continent - it could only decide what it needed for this defense ...

Poland and the Poles are often reproached for their help to Nazi Germany in the destruction of Czechoslovakia in 1938-1939. Indeed, the Teshinsky district, snatched from the Czechs, they worked for Hitler in full. It is also known that the Poles, in fact, repeatedly asked to be assistants to the Fuhrer, primarily in the dreamed campaign against the USSR, but alas, Hitler took them with him only once, that same (Czech) time.

So, for the sake of justice and in the light of the already postulated theory of the "Great War", we should not join this chorus condemning Poland. We must recognize some similarity of the Polish "Teshyn" act to the preventive measures of the same Britain and the USSR

In France during the time of De Gaulle, the following strategy was developed: "Defense in all azimuths." So, for the fighters of the "ideological front": denial "in all azimuths" or even backlashing "in all azimuths" is simply... the wrong strategy. And the current defenders of the ideals and history of Russia should most of all be wary of "approaching

reinforcements" - former professional defenders of the "ideals of socialism", who at one time chose a simple (for themselves) and losing tactic of total denial.

RETURNING TO DIPLOMACY

That's why there's so much "oo tysn shifts" (too much Churchill!) in this book. Although many other Western historians who are not blinded by Russophobia ("conformists", according to Bukovsky's definition), talk about the same thing (about the West's fault in the formation of fascist Germany), but it is Churchill – there is a lot in this book also from the fact that that his view is especially valuable, it is a view from the inside. And the point is not only in Sir Winston's forty years of deputy experience, not only in the unique list of his ministerial posts:

1911-1915 - First Lord of the Admiralty (Minister of the Navy)

1919-1921 - Minister of War and Minister of Aviation;

1924-1929 - Minister of Finance;

1939 - 1940 - Minister of the Navy

1940 - 1945 - head of the coalition government;

1951-1955 head of the Conservative government.

It is also about a unique position that makes it possible to observe things like this one:

— ...(German Ambassador) Ribbentrop was about to leave London at that time and take up the post of German Foreign Minister. Chamberlain gave a farewell breakfast in his honour, at 10 Downing Street. My wife and I also accepted the invitation of the Prime . I noticed that Chamberlain was deep in thought. Later, I was told the contents of the letter: "Hitler has invaded Austria, mechanized units are rapidly advancing towards Vienna." living room to drink coffee. It became clear to me that they really wanted to finish the reception as soon as possible. Everything is covered

95

filled with incomprehensible uneasiness, they stood, preparing to say goodbye to the guests of honor...

However, Ribbentrop and his wife did not seem to notice anything. On the contrary, they lingered for half an hour, engaging the host and hostess in lively conversation. Then Churchill intervened, approached Mrs. Ribbentrop and said a "farewell hastening" phrase: "I hope England and [Germany will maintain friendly relations." "Just try not to break them yourself," she replied coquettishly ... I'm sure that they both understood perfectly well what had happened, but considered it a smart move to keep the Prime Minister from his business duties and the phone longer. .. Finally, Chamberlain turned to the ambassador: "I beg your pardon, but now I have to attend to urgent business" - and left the drawing room without further ado. The Ribbentrops were still delayed, but most of us withdrew under various pretexts. Finally, they bowed out. I never saw Ribbentrop again until he was hanged."

Do you understand the power of that last phrase? Here comes the "social party". Tailcoats, exchange of barbs and all sorts of Bop 10+. And even an urgent dispatch about the threat of a new European war cannot make us forget the requirements of etiquette. It's impossible not to offer the guest coffee (by the way, coffee is served – and it's a must! – in another room, not where breakfast is served. Then I remembered Bulgakov's cat Begemot, who objected to Woland: "You can't kick me out, I still don't have coffee drank")... In short, "solid secular conventions", and the dexterity of the Ribbentrops, with the help of sweet secular chatter, taking away another half an hour from England at a moment when the speed of diplomatic reactions is especially important. But still, the most valuable thing is in that amazing final fragment:

"..Finally, they bowed out. I never saw Ribbentrop again until the moment

how they hung him."

Of course, it should not be understood that Sir Churchill came to Nuremberg in 1946 to look at the hanged Ribbentrop (or at the hanging procedure itself). This, of course, is not Churchill's reminder of things taken for granted: 1) during the war, the ministers of England and `Germany could not see each other; 2) Ribbentrop, how good it is for the whole world

96

it is known that he was one of the first ... "eleven" hanged by sentence in Nuremberg.

This is Churchill's - Meteshcho toy itself - the Voice of History. This is a passing reminder of how the social gatherings at the Chamberlains ended. Sudden reminder, causing even

sound association: ominous chords - "the hand of fate", knocking in Beethoven's sonata. Or an energetic film montage: here is a man in a tailcoat, with a cup of coffee - and here he is with a noose around his neck. Perhaps this is a subconsciously found technique. After all, Churchill, constantly criticizing Chamberlain's policy, his short-sighted "gentlemanliness" with Hitler, never allowed himself a single condemning statement about Chamberlain's personality. Everything is only about his nobility, impeccable manners, impeccable self-control... And here it is, "the heavy tread of fate": it turns out that even the bearers of excellent manners, salon visitors, happen to be hanged.

With this Metetscho toy - addressed to all salon diplomats, Churchill is very reminiscent of Leo Tolstoy. The count in "War and Peace" contemptuously laughs not only at the irresponsibility, but also at the uselessness of all diplomacy of "good form" in the face of the "Big War", sarcastically asking: "... Therefore, it was only worth Metter- niyu, Rumyantsev or Talleyrand, between the exit and the reception, try hard and write a more ingenious piece of paper ... and there would be no war?

Another counterpoint to the first volume of memoirs (the outbreak of war) is yet another Churchillian Meteshcho top: his periodic inserts interrupting the blissful diplomatic chatter: Inquiries about the growth of the Luftwaffe, about the lagging behind of the Royal Air Force. It appears that Sir Winston (1919-1921 Secretary of War and Air Minister) was the first in the British Isles and for a long time the only one to foresee the new role of aviation in the coming war.

YES! BUT THERE WAS ANOTHER THIS ONE IN MUNICH ... LIKE HIS ...

...Mussolini. Exactly! He is! After all, there was also a country - from the category of "Great Powers" (the list is strictly formally defined and very small). That is, there was and

97

one Great Power, which has become "on the other side." There was... for sure, Mussolini, the true owner of the "fascism" brand, who sometimes considered even German "Nazism" either a cheap "licensed copy", or even a fake. (Imagine Mussolini, as the author of the fascist style, is forged, like today's Armani or Gucci.)

There was also a corresponding set of political and diplomatic steps taken by England, France, the USA and the League of Nations, which encouraged Mussolini, turned this... a little pompous, a little decorative character into...

After all, Italy was not a loser in the First World War, and Versailles was a symbol for it — not of humiliation, but, on the contrary, a kind of Christmas tree, a place to receive a few little-deserved (according to a miserable contribution to the victory of 1918) gifts. The more "cleaner the experiment" means, the more interesting and revealing the history of the fascistization of the country in this example.

Lloyd George, who was on friendly terms with Mussolini, noted how he (Mussolini) was struck, how he remembered the case when Oxford students took a solemn oath never to fight for the king and the Motherland ... Here what personally I would bring [Hitler and Mussolini together here, under what term I united them, is impressionism.

Iu Adolf is full of these passages: "And then I understood - Czech! (A Jew, a Croatian, a Russian)", "...then suddenly I made it clear to myself...". That's Mussolini then - "understood the Englishman." (And I misunderstood!) And if we return to the term "political correctness", which has already been mentioned many times, we can summarize: it was English "political correctness" that created Mussolini's "incorrect", incorrect image of an Englishman. After all, this now-famous word "correct", which has become part of the most important global term, just meant (before, at least, it meant) "correct".

The subsequent steps of England (and the League of Nations) to encourage Mussolini will be given very briefly and again with expressive quotations from Churchill. 1935, Mussolini prepares to attack

Abyssinia (Ethiopia). In England, then the prime minister was Baldwin. The coincidence of his policy, his style with the subsequent ones, Chamberlain's, is an additional proof

98

everything I have stated in the "Munich-Czech" chapters. So Churchill:

"It was only a few months later that I began to understand the principles on which the sanctions (against Italy) were based. The Prime Minister stated that, firstly, sanctions mean war, secondly, he was determined to prevent it, thirdly, he was determined to implement sanctions ... Under the leadership of England and Laval (France), the League of Nations committee, tasked with developing the sanctions program, refrained from anything that could provoke a war. A grandiose plan was drawn up, the supply of many goods to Italy was prohibited. But the oil, without which the Abyssinian campaign could not have continued, flowed freely, as it was believed that the cessation of its supply would unleash a war. The export of aluminum to Italy was strictly prohibited, but just aluminum was one of the few metals produced by Italy in quantities exceeding its own needs. The import of scrap iron and iron ore was banned, but steel bars and cast iron were used in the production cycle of Italian metallurgy, and the list was not extended to them ...

Still less did England intend to use her fleet. All sorts of fables were told about Italian dive squadrons with suicide pilots... In fact, this peacefulness was one of the reasons that led to a more terrible war. Mussolini succeeded in his bluff, and from this fact one important observer (Hitler) drew far-reaching conclusions for himself. In Japan, too, they closely watched the development of events...

All Italian supplies went through the Suez Canal, controlled by the British, the English fleet outnumbered the Italian four times.

... But it turned out that we had few fighters for air cover and very few shells for anti-aircraft artillery ... the admiral in command of the fleet was outraged that he was credited with the assertion that he did not have sufficient forces for combat operations (...)"

And so on. The picture of complete chaos, absurdity, fuss, helplessness of governments, until the war finally takes on the character of a Great, People's War, is drawn by Cher

99

Chill is quite colorful. This thirst (probably, of all administrations of the world) is especially noticeable: to pick up as many assignments and functions as possible. And it is especially desirable that these instructions be mutually exclusive, so that it is easier to explain the widespread failures.

And since from the very beginning of the chapter a certain similarity between Churchill and Leo Tolstoy was declared, then evaluate this fragment too:

("War and Peace". Volume 3.)

"Count Rostopchin, who either shamed those who were leaving, then took out official places, then gave out useless weapons to drunken rabble, then raised icons, then forbade Augustine to take out relics and icons, then seized all the private carts that were in Moscow, then on 136 carts he took away the balloon made by Leppich, then he told how he burned his house and wrote a proclamation to the French, solemnly reproaching them for the ruin of his orphanage, then he ordered the people to catch all spies and bring him to him, then he reproached the people, then he gathered the people to the Three Mountains to fight the French, then, in order to get rid of this people, he gave them a man to kill and he himself left for the back gate; either he said that he would not survive the misfortune of Moscow, or he wrote poems in French in albums about his participation in this matter - this man did not understand the significance of the ongoing event, but only wanted to do something himself, to surprise someone ... how the boy frolicked over the majestic and inevitable event of abandonment and

the burning of Moscow and tried with his small hand to either shake it up or hold back the course of the huge stream of people that carried it along with it ... ”

Rostopchin repeats everywhere that his main goals are: 1) maintaining calm in Moscow; 2) gradual evacuation. Surely this corresponded to the orders of the tsar ... And again the word to Lev Nikolaevich:

“If we allow this dual goal, any action of Rastopchin turns out to be irreproachable. Why weren't Moscow's relics, weapons, cartridges, gunpowder, stocks of grain taken out, why were the inhabitants deceived by the fact that Moscow would not be surrendered, and ruined (before they had time to take out their property)? In order to keep calm in the capital... (point 1). Why were piles of unnecessary papers taken out of government offices, Shar Leppikha? - Evacuation (item 2).

100

Yes, it is clear that all the stupid things that are only theoretically possible — they will be committed. Churchill and Tolstoy, you will agree, agree very much in the above quotations. All variants of clouding the mind will inevitably happen. This removal of papers from “public offices” that are unnecessary even in peacetime is already good (imagine, for example, some kind of “Archive of Appeals and Complaints to the DEZ”). But this ball of Leppich is especially beautiful. Apparently, it is still inevitable that in the midst of the most intense war, another madman “with a project” will break through to the authorities and will be listened to, and approved, and provided with all the requested means. It seemed that everyone was laughing at Leppich, saying that his ball would produce some effect, if only (this is me no longer from War and Peace, that ball was remembered by many): “... if only the French will be so kind as to gather in one place (coordinated with the direction of the wind and Mr. Lep Pich)) and squeeze into a crowd as tightly as possible, body to body, and kindly wait until he throws bags of gunpowder, ”but here...

In 1811, the Dutchman Leppich offered this “perpetuum mobile” to Napoleon, but was, of course, expelled. And please, a wonderful lateral, peripheral detail: the Patriotic War is going on. Horses and carts are the most important resource (Andrey Parshev in his book “Why is Russia not America?” in 1812 called the basis of Kutuzov's strategy precisely the achievement of superiority in vehicles)... And this crazy ball on 130 wagons is first dragged to Nizhny Novgorod, then near St. Petersburg, and ... already in November (can you imagine? There are battles near the Berezina) a test launch is made in Oranienbaum. The ball didn't fly...

— It not only seemed to him (Rastopchin) (as it seems to every administrator) that he controlled the external actions of the inhabitants of Moscow, but it seemed to him that he also directed their moods through posters written in the scurrilous language, which the people in their despises the environment and who does not understand when he hears from above... Moscow was burned by the inhabitants, it is true, but not by those who remained in it, but by those who left it. Moscow, occupied by the enemy, did not remain intact, like Berlin, Vienna, only due to the fact that the inhabitants did not bring the keys to the French, but left it.

101

About our Rastopchins, 1941-1942, more will be said, and that relevant chapter should be thrown from here as a bridge - this is the conclusion, this is a semi-intuitive understanding of people like Churchill and Leo Tolstoy: war can be either absurd , or folk ...

It gets ridiculous. Well, don't let go! “Too much Churchill” also because Sir Winston - could he even imagine it! — in 1956, he was mobilized by the Central Committee of the CPSU to conduct purely intra-party clashes. As you know, Khrushchev's “military” accusations against Stalin were reduced, strictly speaking, to two points:

1) led the war on the globe;

2) did not heed Churchill's warning about the imminent start of the WAR.

Khrushchev: "From the now published documents it is clear that as early as April 3, 1941, Churchill, through the British Ambassador to the USSR Cripps, made a personal warning to Stalin that the German troops had begun to redeploy, preparing an attack on the Soviet Union.. Churchill indicated in his message that he asked "to warn Stalin in order to draw his attention to the danger threatening him." Churchill insistently emphasized this both in the telegrams of April 18 and in the following days. However, these warnings were not taken into account by Stalin.

Here, dear readers, it seems to me that the agenda is:

"[W. Churchill's district to appear ... dates, Old Square, building 2, to give evidence."

And Khrushchev, who was probing like a prosecutor: "And tell me more, Citizen Churchill, when you visited Comrade Stalin in Moscow, did you see ... a globe in his office?"

Well, then you have ... the true "testimony of citizen Churchill":

— I wrote a short and cryptic letter, hoping that the facts given and that this was the first letter I sent him after my official telegram of June 25, 1940, recommending Sir Cripps as ambassador, would attract his attention and make him think.

102

Here is this brief and cryptic letter itself... "attached to File No.":

Prime Minister to Stafford Cripps April 3, 1941

Give the following letter from me to Stalin - provided that it is delivered personally by you.

- I have reliable information from a reliable agent that when the Germans considered Yugoslavia caught in their network, i.e. after March 20, they began to transfer three of their five panzer divisions from Romania to southern Poland. As soon as they learned about the Serbian revolution, this movement was cancelled. Your Excellency will easily understand the significance of these facts.

But Ambassador Cripps did not fulfill Churchill's instructions, explaining that the day before he had written a letter to Vyshinsky with approximately the same warnings and was afraid of "weakening the impression" by repeating it. This, however, is the version of Churchill himself, and whether he really wanted his mysterious letter to fall on Stalin's table in time is a difficult question.

...I was annoyed by this and the delay. This was the only message before the German attack that I sent directly to Stalin. Its brevity, its exceptional character, the fact that it came from the head of the government... should have attracted Stalin's attention.

... Lord Beaverbrook told me that during his trip to Moscow in October 1941 you (Mr. Stalin) asked him: "What did Churchill mean when he said in Parliament that he had warned me about the impending German attack? ? "Yes, I did say that," I said, "referring to the telegram I sent you in April 1941." And I took out the telegram which Sir Stafford Cripps delivered late. When the telegram was read and translated to Stalin, he shrugged his shoulders: "I remember it. I didn't need any warnings. I knew that the war would start, but I thought that I could win another six months or so (...)".

On the afternoon of June 22, 1941, Churchill spoke on the radio, the first of the leaders of the countries of the whole world:

103

— The Nazi regime has the worst features of communism. It has no foundations and principles, except for greed and the desire for racial domination ... Over the past 25 years, no one has been a more consistent opponent of communism than me. And I won't take back a single word I said about him. But all this pales before the spectacle now unfolding. The past with its crimes, follies and tragedies disappears.

I see Russian soldiers defending their land, their fields, which their fathers have cultivated since time immemorial. I see them defending their homes, where their mothers and wives pray—yes, for there are times when everyone prays—for the safety of their loved ones... I see tens of thousands of Russian villages where their daily bread is torn from the ground with great difficulty. , but where true human joys exist, where girls laugh and children play. I see how the infamous Nazi war machine, with its dapper, rattling spurs, Prussian officers, with its skillful agents and the gray mass of drilled, ferocious soldiers, is approaching all this ... a machine that has just subdued and tied hand and foot dozens of countries...

... I must announce the decision of His Majesty's Government and I am sure that all the great dominions will agree with this decision in due time, for we must speak out immediately, without a single day of delay ...

We have only one single unchanging goal. We are determined to destroy Hitler and all traces of his Nazi regime. Nothing can turn us away from it, nothing. We will never negotiate, we will never enter into negotiations with Hitler or with any of his gang. We will fight him on land, we will fight him at sea, we will fight him in the air until, with God's help, we have delivered the earth from his very shadow and freed the nations from his yoke. Any person or state that fights against Nazism will receive our help... It follows that we will give Russia and the Russian people all the help we can...

..Now is not the time to moralize about the madness of countries and governments that have allowed themselves to be defeated one by one, although together they were able to save themselves and the whole world (...)

104

On July 3, 1941, in a radio address to the Soviet people, Stalin said: "... The historic speech of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Churchill, about helping the Soviet Union and the declaration of the US government about its readiness to help our country, which can only cause a feeling gratitude in the hearts of the peoples of the Soviet Union are quite understandable and exemplary."

Chapter 9

NEW TOP MANAGERS OF "UNITED EUROPE"

Researchers of the phenomenon of Nazi Germany have long ago sorted out almost all the famous organizations of that time "according to their interests". There are also serious scientific books, there are also some kind of clubs, Internet forums of history lovers on the NSDAP, SS, SA, SD, General Staff, Abwehr, Gestapo...

So. Of all such organizations in Germany, one seems to me very underestimated, underconsidered, almost forgotten against the backdrop of these colorful SS men. This is the Imperial Ministry of Armaments and Munitions (Kriegsmarine). In this chapter, of course, I do not pretend to provide a comprehensive coverage of the history of this unique corporation, but ... I will "throw in", introduce into the discussion two important, as it seems to me, theses.

These two important theses are highlighted, respectively, through two dates, the importance of which, in my opinion, is very underestimated:

1) March 17, 1940 - the date of the creation of the Reich Ministry of Armaments and Munitions;

2) November 29, 1941 — the date of submission by First Minister Todt of his famous "suicidal" report to Hitler ("... the war has already been lost by us, etc....").

So. On March 17, 1940, the Reich Ministry of Armaments and Ammunition (Kessntiepit @e \Maye ip Miep op) was created, which became the main organizer of the German military industry until the end of the war. Here is the first interesting question: why in March 1940?! Semi

105

It seems that Germany, both in the period of preparation for war (its famous "Four-Year Plan"), and in the first six months with more than a world war, somehow managed without this ministry. How did you manage? It seems that the answer is obvious, and the next two paragraphs are, in fact, a reference, a squeeze from several ascertaining works.

Each branch of the armed forces designed, issued orders and received weapons, military economic property and ammunition, developed plans for the material support of its production program. And the direct producers were "old German concerns".

For example, German tank building was run by nine major concerns that supplied tanks and armored hulls. They controlled 32 factories owned 27 times by private firms. And it is characteristic that these firms specialized not only in this area. Of the eight Daimler-Benz factories, only one produced tanks.

That is, the structure of German manufacturing firms functioned as it had developed back in the 19th century.

These are all easily verifiable facts, only leading to the main question: what, in fact, has changed by March 1940 ?! What is the reason for such a radical reform? Of course, this is a new level of weapon needs for the Wehrmacht... BUT the main thing is the new level of capabilities available. New mines, power plants, deposits, factories... In April 1940, only a throw was planned - Denmark, Norway, in May - Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and further, the super prize - France. BUT the experience of the protectorates of the Czech Republic and Moravia, which at that time had already been working on it for two years, prompted [Hitler: "industrialized", "cultural" countries will hand over everything intact, "without fanatical excesses" and will dutifully work (perhaps, and expecting that someone will someday risk the integrity of their "immovable property", start a real war, "come", "liberate"). So everything and

out.

That is, the competent administrators of the Reich saw the whole difference in the situation: Germany was preparing for war, Germany fought for six months according to the old, "national" scheme, and now it is necessary to accept

106

beginning of the whole European industry. That is, the Imperial Ministry of Armaments and Ammunition (Kessptiepit @e \U/aye ipa Mip op), which was led by the notorious Todt and Speer, is the first and most important. the ministry of precisely "United Europe-1" ("Berlin")!

This is what the date March 17, 1940 means.

The Czechoslovaks are already working, but as for the Norwegians, Danes, Dutch, Belgians and French in the Reich, there is a calm certainty: they will work!

The Reich received huge French strategic reserves: 8.5 thousand tons of oil, tens of thousands of tons of non-ferrous metals, 5,000 steam locomotives, 40,000 cars (although this is combined with Belgian and Dutch ones).

However, there was a problem in the broad sense of the word: food. In the spring of 1941, consumption rates for a number of food products were reduced in the Reich. But it turns out that officials from the Ministry of Food calculated long before that: "The European war can be continued only if the entire Wehrmacht is in the third year of hostilities (that means, counting from September 39th, and not from June On the 41st, the third year of the war in Russia was not planned in any way.—I.Sh.) will be fed at the expense of Russia."

On May 15, German newspapers announced that the meat ration, issued by cards, would be cut by 100 grams per week from June. The representation of horsemeat in this diet grew more and more. Here is another, perhaps somewhat unexpected, example of understanding the essence of that war. Our poet, also of a princely family ("also" — I recalled the French Count Exupery, mentioned in the 1st chapter, the hero of the Resistance, used as an ideological cover for French and European collaborators), wrote exquisite, "neoclassical" poems before and after the war. But in the war itself, the wounded guard captain wrote:

You do not consider our land a paradise,

And with the edge of wheat, someone else's loaf, With a bayonet you cut off the best third. We know for sure what we are dying for: We are taking away your native land,

And you - to die for stolen bread!

Arseny Tarkovsky

107

German breweries were short of barley. Ersatz beer was made on the basis of dairy production waste. Drinking it was, of course, the most difficult, perhaps unbearable test for the "Aryan spirit." In general, even France's diligent annual reparations deliveries did not help: 750,000 tons of wheat, 140,000 tons of meat, 650 million liters of milk, 220 million liters of wine. This is what became the main factor for the developers of the Barbarossa plan.

Next, we will quote the English historian Liddell Hart (Sir Basil Henry Liddell Hart - Mr. Vaz! Nepgu [.194e! Nats), who became the leading modern British historian, whose work "The Second World War" became, according to experts, "almost the main official history of the English armed - nyh forces.

"...According to Hitler, [Germany should have acquired more 'agriculturally useful space' in the sparsely populated regions of Eastern Europe. It would be vain to hope that this space would be readily conceded to her. "The history of all times – the Roman Empire, the British Empire – has proved that any spatial expansion can be carried out only by suppressing resistance, by risk... Neither in past times, nor now did space exist and does not exist without an owner" . This problem should have been solved no later than 1945, because "after that, only changes for the worse can be expected." All possible channels of supply would then be blocked, and the food supply crisis would worsen.

Hitler's plans were much broader than the intention to return the territories taken from Germany after the First World War, and it would be wrong to claim that Western statesmen were not aware of this. In 1937-1938, many of them were quite frank in private conversations, but not in their public speeches. Many proposals were put forward in British government circles to allow Germany to expand eastward and thus avert the danger from the West. These circles took a benevolent attitude towards Hitler's desire to acquire living space and made it clear to him. However, they do not bother

We tried to think about how, if not by the use of overwhelming force, the owners of this space could be forced to submit (...)."

German documents show that Hitler was particularly encouraged by the visit of Lord Halifax in November 1937. Halifax was then Lord President of the Council, second in government to the Prime Minister. A transcript of the conversation between Halifax and Hitler has been preserved. Halifax made it clear to Hitler that England would not interfere with him in Eastern Europe. Perhaps Halifax did not mean exactly this, but such was the impression from his words, and it was extremely important ...

I would like to complete the topic of "incentive-nourishing" motives for adopting the "Barbarossa" plan with an example of a surprisingly accurate understanding of this abstruse "German geopolitics" by our people, what Halder calls the "Continental thinking of the Fuhrer". And this understanding was expressed with such dignity and truly simply with royal sarcasm that it is impossible not to be filled with pride for compatriots...

In addition to the famous "Moscow march" of columns of German prisoners, on August 16, 1944, "... the escort of a group of German prisoners in the amount of 36,918 people" was also carried out in the city of Kyiv. The NKVD monitored the behavior of our citizens during the passage. All statements, cries, actions were carefully recorded. There were, of course, spitting, threats, calls to shoot, BUT... throwing stones was not recorded... Academician of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Sokolov "compared this to 1941, when the Germans were leading Soviet prisoners... ours are not right, admitting such a good attitude towards the Fritz>.

And here is this truly delightful, albeit underestimated episode (from Khrushchev's report to Stalin): "... in the bazaar area, young women threw eggshells into the column with exclamations: "Would you like an egg ?!"

Ordinary women who have lost their father, husband and are doomed to decades of niche, living in dugouts and the hardest work to restore what was carefully preserved in France and the Netherlands, these women, who heard for two or three years

109

the main German geopolitical slogan "Milk, bread, eggs!" - they found a nobly simple and ingeniously witty answer ...

It is also interesting - I don't know if anyone paid attention: among the leaders of the new level of "European management" - the ministers of Keszti! The first Reich Minister was Fritz Todt, previously the head of the nationwide construction organization "Todt", which created the famous Reichsautobahns to this day. But on November 29, 1941 (literally one day before the start of our counter-offensive near Moscow), Todt submitted a very gloomy report to the Fuhrer ("the war has already been lost militarily and economically, a political settlement is needed") and then in 1942 he died in - how much of a strange aviation accident.

The next and, in fact, the last Reich Minister was the favorite architect of the Fuhrer Speer. He suddenly turned out to be a very successful leader of the industry of the "United Europe". In two years, he managed, for example, to achieve a threefold increase in the production of armored vehicles. The years of his leadership of the ministry are called the "era of Speer". Even among the questions to him at the Nuremberg trials, there were such ... with a certain touch of admiration: "But how did you succeed?"

But let's not draw too much of a note of admiration for this "European manager" — he still lost to the USSR in terms of tank production. - rests on German skilled labor.

The "Speer" principle of duplicating the supply of units and assemblies from different plants was unnecessarily complicated and led to huge overloads of the transport system. For example, 136 subcontractors took part in the production of Rap2er Y Rap{Nerr. Hulls were supplied by 6 factories, engines - 2, gearboxes - 3, tracks - 4, turrets - 5, weapons - |, optics - 1, steel castings - 14, forgings - 15, the rest - finished units, parts and fixture.

Speer's "apology" is the need to disperse capacities and reduce their vulnerability to air

110

bombardments. BUT, you can again recall the KV tanks, produced in besieged Leningrad, the Stalingrad tractor.

AMATEUR INQUIRIES

And why, exactly?

And why exactly on November 29, 1941, that same Todt went ... etc.2?

Indeed, it is interesting to reflect on the date of the suicide "Todt" report to the Führer ("the war is lost")... 29 November. Why exactly then?

Maybe the "business executive" Todt somehow found out about the Soviet military strike being prepared for December, which became sudden even for the German generals, and was afraid that instead of the Reichsautobahns he would soon have to build the BAM? This variant: "with secret help, the business executive knew before the intelligence officers and generals" - this, of course, is nonsense, Alexander-Dymovism. My guess is this. The date of the Todt report is, as it were, the point of solution of the equation:

1) the point of obtaining the maximum piece of the country of the USSR;

but at the same time:

2) chronological point BEFORE the first military defeat.

After all, he, Todt, is responsible for the economic return of the occupied lands. Let's say:

1) August-41 — he got too little to judge;

2) January-42 - his economic problems are already obscured by military defeat.

And the end of November-41 is just that: he, Todt, already has all of Ukraine, Belarus and half of the black earth at his disposal, and so far there seem to be no claims to the military. Offensive schedule: captured square kilometers/days - almost like in the Polish or French campaigns. But as for his own "eparchy"... the prospects for the economic development of the captured giant piece of the USSR, the prospects for "cooperation" with the local population, as it turned out...

...Them (all these "prospects"), simply mockingly savoring, lists Ilya Ehrenburg:

111

In Kaluga, two swindlers promised to "arrange the production of gas water." No, don't be alarmed, "gas water" is not in terms of chemical weapons - "soda". How many Germans rushed with this couple! - and the implementation ... well, imagine the vital importance of soda in occupied Kaluga! And in Kyiv - another sign of "development of the territory" - a newspaper began to appear. The publisher, as it turned out, was the Romanian pimp Buzeskul...

And that's almost all...

In December 1941 a special commission for the production of tanks and spare parts studied the possibility of attracting the industrial potential of the occupied part of the USSR. Some hopes were pinned on the production of tank armored hulls at the plant named after Ilyich in Mariupol, which the Germans got with less damage ... But this plant, like other Soviet plants, was not included in the Nazi ZAO Europe. After all, indeed, during the retreat we also had unsuccessful explosions of factory buildings, and the Nazis seemed to get them - as in Europe - intact. But they didn't work! Precisely because the "blocking stake" (if we continue the stock terminology in the spirit of CJSC "Europe") was owned by "cadres", people, labor collectives.

And if in Paris, Bordeaux, Brussels, Copenhagen, Prague, Brno they were ready to work under any flag, then in Mariupol, Donbass, the situation was completely different!

Recently, in the spring of 2009, on the well-known site Free Press, there was a reprint from the French media: "Photographs that have become a national shame for France." (The name expressing the assessment is their own, French.) Shots, Paris 1940-1944, absolutely, ideally peaceful and quiet city, cyclists, unarmed Germans flanking, smiles, kisses. Atmosphere... Of course, it's silly to try to put it into words, it's better to take a look yourself. Convince yourself: in comparison with the blissful Paris of 1943, even the Paris of the times of Minister of the Interior Sarkozy and young Arabs burning cars is "almost Stalingrad"!

But let's return from the realities of life of Hitler's CJSC "Europe" - in the USSR

112

Add, in addition to the real resistance of the former labor collectives, the dependence of factories on infrastructure: water pumps and power lines were blown up. The famous "rail war". |

True, these sabotage had to be paid not only with "real estate". In Belorussia, the Germans put 400 hostages on the rails and launched a steam locomotive... But for the citizens of the countries that were former shareholders of Hitler's CJSC Europe, these horrors are hard to imagine. The most imaginable Resistance heroes are Keanu Reeves and his girlfriend in The Matrix.

This is the point of view from which Reich Minister Todt saw the hopelessness and loss of the war - as early as November 29, 1941 (a week, in fact, before our military strike near Moscow).

ANOTHER BUSINESS IN EUROPE

In 1940-1941, German tank-building firms, at the direction of the Ministry of Armaments and Ammunition, ordered a number of parts from small machine-building firms in France, Belgium, Denmark, and Romania. But a special contribution was made by the Škoda factories in Pilsen and ĽKD in Prague (renamed by the Germans to VMM), which until the very end of the war produced light tanks and self-propelled guns of their own, Czech design for the Wehrmacht.

In Austria, on the basis of the Styrian mines near Linz, a large metallurgical plant was built with workshops for the production of armored hulls. Similar workshops operated at the quality metallurgy plant of the Beler company in Kalfenberg. This made it possible to build medium and heavy tanks at the large Nibelungen plant in St. Valentine. Its products, as well as those of the Czech firms Skoda and VMM, are listed as German in all statistical reports.

Let us once again give the floor to Reich Minister Speer, or rather, let us reproduce the speech delivered by him at the Nuremberg trials:

"The steady increase in military production up to the autumn of 1944 is truly amazing. However, this was

113

not enough to meet the needs of the front, and every front-line soldier can confirm this sad fact. Fierce fighting in Russia and Normandy, as well as catastrophic retreats in the summer of 1944, led to such losses that our rear could not make up ... the denouement came after the fuel supply was cut off and our communications as a result of the devastating raids of the Anglo-Americans. Although there were armaments and ammunition in Germany, they, at least in sufficient quantities, could no longer be delivered to the front.

On the other hand, the Allies had everything they needed, and the resources at the disposal of the Allied Commands in the United States and in the British Empire were so great that it was possible to transfer to Russia a huge amount of war material. It should not be forgotten that Russia itself was superior to the Western allies in the production of artillery pieces and tanks.

The overwhelming economic superiority of the enemy and our inability to repel his air raids clearly showed that we had no chance of a victorious conclusion to the war. I don't blame the German industry. Its achievements were enormous, yet it could not compete with the manufacturing power of the United States, the British Empire, and the Soviet Union. War at the same time with these three powers was madness for Germany

and could only have one outcome.

The assertion that the war could have been won if there had been no betrayal and sabotage is refuted by the facts cited above. Even if we admit that sabotage really took place, then even then we will have to admit that it could hasten the loss of the war, but was not the main reason for our defeat. It is said that the saboteurs belonging to the opposition did everything in their power to hasten the destruction of Germany. They declare that they interfered with the production of weapons and ammunition and gave wrecking orders, maintained contact with the enemy, and in every possible way hindered the sending of reinforcements to the front. But all the literature on the resistance movement, including the works of hostile writers, does not contain a single piece of evidence that sabotage was ever carried out at the front. Separate cases took place shortly before the start of the war,

114

at the beginning of the campaign in France and in the last months of the war, when members of the resistance movement established political contacts with the enemy. This is all (...).

This quote from a top manager of CJSCEurope is given here as a transition to the next topic research:

"Resistance Movement in Europe". After all, if we carry out the usual conversion of terms associated with the transition to the opposite point of view, changing "vile spies" to "brave intelligence officers", then the "traitors and saboteurs" mentioned above by Speer are those figures of the Resistance, "whose contribution to the common..." or, say, whose "help" to the Soviet Victory we are trying to evaluate. And here it is - the most important assessment of the interrogated Reich Minister: "... so, they didn't particularly annoy." And he, Speer, already vigorously and categorically refutes the hypothesis of the "decisive contribution of the saboteurs".

Killer, if you think about it, for "liberal Europe" evidence. And most importantly - this is the most qualified, final evidence. But the importance of the topic does not allow us to confine ourselves to this assessment. In the vast historical layer, we will certainly find other, perhaps even opposite, assessments. This one, Speer's, is important precisely as a general systemic view, the view of a person who dealt only with the macroeconomic problems of the United Europe. The potential of countries, industries, building optimal connections, communication routes and damage from bombing, the capture and loss of deposits... in general, from these heights, the Resistance was barely visible, or rather, imperceptible.

Another top manager, Chief of the General Staff of the Wehrmacht, General Halder:

"My commander-in-chief and I opposed Hitler whenever it was necessary to prevent him from making a decision which, in our opinion, was unfavorable for Germany and the army. But everything that the troops needed to carry out their difficult and difficult tasks was always sent to the front. In the fight against Hitler, we never took actions that could cause any harm to our troops at the front.

It was said that during the last months of the war no reinforcements arrived, that the equipment laid down for the infantry from

115

was sent to tank divisions, and the infantry received fuel intended for tank units. Anyone who was at the front at that time will understand the reasons for this situation. In the last months of the war, our communications were so disrupted that it was virtually impossible to ensure the delivery of replacements to their destination. The commanders of the battle groups took into their own hands everything that followed through the areas where their troops were located. We knew very well that reinforcements, military equipment and fuel destined for the front were also delayed by the Gauleiters, who used all this for their own Volkssturm units (...).

This is Halder's answer to yet another hypothesis: "Were the interruptions in the supply of the front in recent months the merit of some organization of the Resistance, one of the two Capellas? And further, Halder:

"It remains to clarify our attitude to the events of June 20, 1944 - the assassination attempt on Hitler. Personally, I learned about this from a message transmitted by radio; at that time we were engaged in heavy defensive battles in the region of Lvov. We were all literally stunned when we learned that a German officer was able to carry out an assassination attempt, and, most importantly, at such a moment when the soldiers on the Eastern Front were fighting a deadly fight, trying to stop the advance of the Russian troops. We were well aware of the abuses committed by the leaders of the "brown shirts", especially the "Reichskommissars", as well as the arrogant behavior of these people and the crimes of the leaders of the special detachments (Einsatzgruppen) of the SS, although we rarely felt the presence of these suspicious personalities near the front. . Party leaders were not very popular at the front. During periods of calm, many expressed their dissatisfaction with the behavior of these "gentlemen", and everyone said that this should be dealt with immediately after the end of the war. Nevertheless, the front-line soldiers - ama, officers of the General Staff in the troops, we are proud to be among them - were outraged when they heard about the assassination attempt; The soldier at the front did his duty to the very end. It was only during our imprisonment in the camp that we learned in more detail about what had caused the assassination attempt on Hitler. I must admit that the people responsible for this

116

were guided by lofty ideals and a deep consciousness of their responsibility for the fate of our country. Colonel Count Stauffenberg and his associates from the OKH realized that the Hitler regime would lead Germany to disaster. They deeply believed that eliminating Hitler would save Germany from further bloodshed. But if the attempt on Hitler's life had succeeded, it would have led to a bloody internal feud with the SS troops. In foreign policy, this would not lead to any success either. The enemy decided to pursue a policy of "unconditional surrender" regardless of whether or not there will be a National Socialist government in [Germany. With such a policy, Roosevelt only strengthened the will to resist every German and thereby made the same mistake as the German political leaders in Russia, who did not see the difference between the Communists and the Russian people. If the attempt on Hitler's life had succeeded, all Germans would have blamed the catastrophe on our officer corps and especially on the German General Staff. In any case, we should not forget that the war was lost by non-participants in the conspiracy of July 20, 1944 (...).

The death penalty for a variety of manifestations of disobedience (such as spreading hostile rumors), declared as part of the "total war", increased the atmosphere of terror in the home front, but could not save the Nazi regime. If during the First World War in Germany 90 people were executed for state crimes, then during the Second World War - about 30 thousand. The memorandums of the SD, which were intended for the top leadership of the Third Reich, paid special attention to the defeatist moods that engulfed young people of pre-conscription age. In the largest cities, alternative associations of semi-criminal youth began to spring up spontaneously, calling themselves "pirates". The fermentation of the rear gradually began to embrace the army, the introduction of the post of officer for National Socialist education did not compensate for the decline in the morale of the soldiers. The super-total mobilization carried out in July 1944 gave only 300 thousand new soldiers, although more than a million were needed to simply compensate for the casualties of the Wehrmacht.

117

ATTACHED EUROPEAN MANAGER PORTRAIT

A few more words should be said about the second and last minister of Cespztii\$epit fe\MaPe un4 Mipop. Mainly because in the book "Inside the Third Reich" published in 1970 by Albert Speer, in addition to a huge amount of facts and "exclusive" observations, there is one, almost passing remark, very important for our "dossier".

"Inside the Third Reich" is recognized as "the most outstanding political memoir of all time." Speer wrote it in the fortress-prison of Spandau, while serving a 20-year sentence under a sentence he received in Nuremberg. He wrote secretly, handing them "to the will" piece by piece.

And at the International Military Tribunal itself in 1946, Speer drew attention on two points: 1) he was the only one of all the defendants who admitted his guilt for the crimes of the Third Reich: "This trial is necessary, in an authoritarian system for such terrible crimes everyone bears common responsibility »; 2) he was the only one who had a definite personal relationship with Adolf Hitler.

Thanks to this clause, Albert Speer was not only the defendant in Nuremberg, but also the most "requested" witness. It is clear that behind the dock of the tribunal the figure of the Fuhrer was "virtually" towering and piling up. Scientists, historians and psychologists, primarily Western ones, wanted to somehow explain, rationalize, isolate the "psychological preconditions". Albert, in general, did not kick back from this role, stating: "It seems to me that if my Hitler ever had a friend, that friend would be me." It was known that the Fuhrer, being himself a failed architect, saw in Speer the embodiment of his own youthful dreams. It is also recorded that Hitler stood chained to Speer's sketches and models for hours. In 1938, he presented him with the Golden Party Badge.

Speer was born on March 15, 1905 in Mannheim. Studied architecture, was an assistant at the Berlin Institute of Technology. In 1931 he joined the NSDAP, and in 1932 he joined the SS. He was a member of several minor architectural commissions for the construction of the headquarters of Gauleiter Berley

118

on, then he was entrusted with the technical support of the gigantic party congress in Tempelhof | May 1933. Speer's masterful use of rapidly erected flagpoles and unusual lighting effects gave Nazi mass gatherings a distinctly pompous style. In 1934, he was assigned to develop a project for arranging a site for party congresses in Nuremberg.

Here I must make a small clarification. Everyone repeats: "Architect, architect..." And in this chapter I myself combined Speer with the builder Todt, trying to deduce a certain regularity. BUT, strictly speaking, at the moment when the Fuhrer approached him, Speer did not build, did not design

buildings. The design of congresses, parades, pavilions is still a different area, albeit a related one. (In modern Russia, this is done by the famous designer Krasnov.) It was only much later that Speer received architectural commissions from Hitler. It turns out that the case of Speer, as well as the unprecedented impromptu with the conqueror of Norway, General Falkenhorst (von Yastrzhembsky), analyzed by us in Chapter 9, is a manifestation of a certain intuition of Hitler.

"He brought a capable architect closer to him, appointed him head of the department of the German Labor Front and introduced his deputy to the headquarters. In 1937, Speer became the Reich's chief inspector of architecture, with the task of "making Berlin again the real and true capital [of the German Reich]." Realizing the grandiose plans of Hitler, Speer worked tirelessly: he designed state institutions, stadiums, palaces, monuments and entire super-cities for the future Greater Germany. Speer openly expressed admiration for the ideas of his patron, which other architects called "insane sentimentality" fit for the last century (...).

In 1941 Speer was elected to the Reichstag. Ace of 1942, he is the Minister of Armaments and the Military Industry in place of Fritz Todt, who died in a strange aviation accident. Speer was also a member of the central planning commission, general inspector of water resources and energy, director of the organization Todt, leader of the National Socialist Corps of Drivers and

119

head of the main party technological department. For some time he was considered the second man in the Third Reich and the undisputed dictator of the German military industry. He achieved extraordinary production results despite opposition from other Nazi leaders and despite heavy casualties from Allied bombing. In the last weeks of the war, he resisted [Hitler's] orders to pursue a scorched earth policy.

In his testimony, Speer claimed that his activities were "technological and economic" and not political, that he was only an architect, and that all he knew about what was happening was what he could read in the newspaper. zeta. But he admitted that he rejected the cruelty (of the Hitler machine) not on the basis of humanity, but from a practical point of view, since excessive cruelty would be a hindrance in his efforts to increase production. The Tribunal limited itself to recognizing Speer's "complicity" in the forced labor program: "As a mitigating circumstance, it was recognized that ... in the final stages of the war, he was one of the few who had the courage to tell Hitler that the war is lost, and to prevent senseless destruction of industrial enterprises. Speer was found guilty on count 3 (war crimes) and count 4 (crimes against humanity).

| On October 1946, he was sentenced to 20 years in the Spandau prison in Berlin. He was released, as we would say, "on call", in 1966. This is also an interesting fact, considering that hundreds of German generals were released after 3-9 years.

Now back to Speer's book "Inside the Third Reich": "...the most outstanding political memoirs of all time. The book demonstrates how [Hitler's] unlimited power could be combined with the new mechanism provided by modern technology." But for the purposes of our study, I take out one very important observation from Speer's memoirs and ask you to recall it in the chapter "How many columns were there?". It seems to me that there is and will be more and more developed in the politically correct works of scientists from the United Europe (Brussels) the idea that the previous "United Europe" (Berlin) was a kind of monolith,

120

became the unbridled will of Hitler. Behind this "monolith" lies the responsibility and even the economic interest of countries like France, Belgium, the Czech Republic, and Holland. They write about the "cruel orders of the Fuhrer", but there were also "orders" (and prepaid). So Speer writes that "... the Third Reich was actually very far from a monolithic totalitarian state, but was only a fragmented feudal principality controlled by local politicians. Each defended his own personal interests and sought for his own benefit, not caring about the cost of the war.

HYMN TO TECHNOCRATS

Speer's principle of "industry's self-responsibility", and most importantly, the innovative planning system he developed (to a large extent included in modern management theory) became one of the main successes of Germany in that war. But even the most indisputable successes of the Reich Minister of Armaments did not save him from the intrigues of [Yering, Himmler, and most of all, Bormann. Speer recalls how he once brought Hitler an issue of the English newspaper The Observer for April 9, 1944. Hitler put on his glasses and sat down to read:

— In a sense, Speer is more important for Germany today than Hitler, Himmler, Goering, [Goebbels, or even generals. Somehow it so happened that they began to work in the wings of this man, who really ensures the operation of a giant engine and squeezes the maximum possible out of it. His example is a pure example of the managerial revolution. Speer is not one of those operetta-painterly Nazis who are always in sight. In general, it is not clear whether he has any other than the most common political convictions. He could easily join any party that would provide him with a job and a career. This is a pronounced type of successful average person - well dressed, polite, uncorrupt. And according to the way of life of the family (wife and six children) - typically the middle class. To a much lesser extent than any other of the German leaders, he is reminiscent of something German or

typically national

121

socialist. He probably embodies the type that is increasingly beginning to play an important role in all belligerent countries - a pure technician, not belonging to any class, a brilliant person without a noble birth, who has no other goal than how to break through, relying on your technical and organizational abilities. It is the absence of psychological and spiritual ballast and the ease with which he handles the terrible mechanism of our era that allows him to advance so far ... We can get rid of the Hitlers and Himmlers, but the Speers will be among us (...)

"Hitler carefully read to the end, folded the sheet

twice and silently gave it to me with some kind of reverence," Speer recalls. Almost in the same words (believe me - and we just se

save space in this book) and Speer himself describes Wernher von Braun's team of rocket technocrats... About other production lines:

"I had the intention to establish mass production of consumer goods in France, Belgium, Holland: clothing, footwear, textiles, furniture, so that enterprises of a similar profile in [Germany] would reorient themselves to military products ... I invited a French colleague to Berlin. Minister Bichelonne, professor at the Sorbonne, had a reputation for being extremely capable and energetic. Not without some wrangling with the Foreign Ministry, I managed to get him accepted as a guest of the German government. On September 17 I received Bichelonne, with whom I had almost friendly relations. We were both young, we believed that the future belonged to us... I was ready to cancel the territorial robbing of France... all the more, in my opinion, it is not so important where the state borders in Europe are, with the connection together by joint production.

The key issue that day was the deportation of labor from France to Germany (up to 50,000 people /

month). Bichelonne disregarded the instructions of Laval (French Prime Minister), I of Sauckel. The agreed plan was beneficial

for both sides ... Factories were identified that were withdrawn from Sauckel's practice of forcible mobilization of the worker

122

forces, which was announced by safe-conduct signed by my personal signature ... in the end, all the leading enterprises, ten thousand in number, turned out to be outside the sphere of Sauckel ... Instead of 50,000, less than 5,000 people began to be deported. | On March 1944, Sauckel reported with irritation: "My services report that everything has come to an end. In all prefectures it is the same: Minister Bichelonne concluded an agreement with Minister Speer (...)".

Admit it: in these descriptions United (by Hitler) Europe-1| and "United Europe"-2 (current) - well, they are simply indistinguishable. The same spirit of optimization, calculation, cooperation.

Only a small touch is missing: for Speer to transfer his ministry (Kespzt! "epit @e wye ippa Meep Shop) to Brussels, the capital of today's European technocrats.

This means that we need to clarify our historical balance: among the opponents of the USSR then were not only fanatics like Hitler, Sauckel, [ebbels, but also European top managers like Speer, Wernher von Braun.

CHAPTER 10

"ABOUT PROPERTY TRANSFERRED TO THE TRUST MANAGEMENT, (and a little about public order during the transfer period)

In order to present the full scale of the Czech-Hitler cooperation, it is appropriate to give a general idea of the power of at least one or two Czech enterprises.

The history of the Škoda concern began in 1859: Count Wallenstein-Wargenberg founded foundries and machine-building factories in the city of Pilsen, producing equipment for sugar mills, breweries, mines, steam engines and boilers, elements of metal bridges and iron railway facilities. In 1869, the engineer and entrepreneur Emil Skoda (Etyi Koda) became the owner of the factory, and his name became a trademark.

123

In the 1880s, Skoda was Europe's foremost foundry and metalworking enterprise, whose products were used for the most iconic objects of the 20th century: power plants at Niagara Falls, locks in the Suez Canal area. During the First World War, Škoda, the largest arms manufacturer in Austria-Hungary, supplied heavy guns and ammunition for the army and navy.

In 1917, the factories in Pilsen alone had 35,000 workers. Škoda, one of the firms that have secured Czechoslovakia's place in the world in arms exports, supplies them to South America and Asia, to the Far Eastern countries.

In 1925, the automobile company Gaipp & Yueter {, about which the following should be said, became part of Skoda. In 1895, Laurin (Vastau Gaipp) and Klement (Vaau Ketepe ()) founded the production of bicycles "Slavia" (Zama). And 4 years later, in 1899, the company Gaipp & Yuetene decided to move from the production of bicycles to the production of motorcycles ,

instantly gained popularity. This decision quickly made the company famous, thanks to the performance of new motorcycles in various international competitions. In 1905, the first car "Wozigeie A" came off, like the first motorcycles, which was a huge success. It is Wozigeie A that has secured a stable position for Gaipp & Yuetep+ in the growing international car market. And in 1907, thanks to the gradually expanding production, which went beyond the family business, [aiip & Ketep {founded a joint-stock company. In 1911, the \$ model car with a 14 hp engine was put into production. It became the most popular model of the company before the First World War, not only in the country, but also abroad. Branches of the firm were established in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kyiv and Rostov. Large consignments of cars were sold to Japan, China, Australia, Mexico, [Germany and England.

But in addition to cars and trucks, the company at various times produced aircraft engines and aircraft, racing cars, stationary electricity generators, road rollers and much more, which is truly unusual for car companies.

During the First World War, the company's activities were focused on the production of military equipment.
technology.

124

Further development of the automotive industry: the model "Skoda Monte Carlo" (1935) got its name in honor of the victory at the Monte Carlo Rally.

In 1939, the AZAR \$Koda company became part of the German industrial group Soeipe-Negtapp\egke (Hermann Goering Werke) and switched to the production of military products. Off-road vehicles for the army were produced on the basis of Skoda Superb and Skoda 900. Gas generating trucks, heavy caterpillar tractors (K\$O - Caireps\$sSherreg O\$, "Vostok crawling tractor"). In August 1940, with the permission of the German authorities, Skoda sold Hungary a license to produce the T-22.

True... the re-entry of Skoda in 1991 into the German concern had a completely peaceful character. And it was no longer doepp "- Negtapp \ Me! Ke, but \ o! K \$ \ asepp Ogochr.

Those who suspect the Skoda team of complete irresponsibility and moral indifference to the consequences of their "work" will be wrong. Here is a fragment from the official history of the plant:

"In February 1934, Škoda presented a mock-up of the \$Ch light tank to the military leadership of the country, and in the spring it made its prototype. The tank had armor from 8 to [5 mm and developed a speed of up to 30 km per hour, the cruising range was 150 km.

By the end of the tests of the first model, Skoda had developed an improved sample of \$-P-a (\$ - EKo4da, P - light tank, a - designed for cavalry) with armor, hull and turret increased to 25 mm thick. The tanks were equipped with 37-mm guns, which were produced by the same Skoda. Until 1939, the Skoda plant produced 295 tanks...

Unfortunately, after the occupation of Czechoslovakia, its tanks were included in the German fascist units and participated in the capture of Poland, France, in the war against the Soviet Union. The last tank of Czech production was destroyed on December 10, 1941 during the liberation of the city of Klin near Moscow.

Some tanks with turrets removed were used as coastal defense artillery tractors in Denmark ... "

What can be added here? The Skoda team has moral responsibility, but it is still lighter than their "light and medium" tanks. Here they write: they released 295 tanks, unfortunately, they got to Hitler, but by December 10, 1941

125

years they were finished, and it was documented that they did not go further than the city of Klin near Moscow. That is, responsibility is recognized for tanks riveted in the 30s. And six years of uninterrupted production of new tanks, jeeps, trucks and other military equipment - this, in general, is not our history, but the Negtapp concern - @oepps-!e! GKe ... But the fact that the old "stock of tanks ran out by 10 December 1941," this is the most common practice, the reality of that war. The "consumption" of the German T-P itself would be about the same, and there is no reason to consider December 10 a holiday - the Day of the end of responsibility for tanks ...

During the war, Skoda produced the German light tank Ryo KrAm1 35.

All special encyclopedias call the best among the light and medium tanks of the Wehrmacht another model - P2 Krÿ-38, the manufacturer is the VMM concern. This VMM is the former (until 1939) another famous ŷKD-Praha plant. And the R2 KrPi-38x tank (really a very successful model) is the Czech TMNR-\$ tank, which was exported to Iran, Sweden, Switzerland, Romania. Immediately after the annexation of the Czech Republic, the Wehrmacht ordered 350 vehicles, and a total of 1411 units were manufactured (according to other sources - 1300).

And briefly about the history and potential of the ChKD plant itself. Its full name is Czech-Moravian Kolben Danek, it appeared in 1927 as a result of the merger of the First Czech-Moravian Machine-Building Factory, Kolben and Companions, Danek and Companions.

The "First Bohemian-Moravian Engineering Factory" was founded in the 1870s. Specialization - equipment for the digestive and chemical workshops and steel structures, steam locomotives, wagons. In 1907, together with the Ringhoffer company, he founded the PRAGUE company for the production of cars and trucks.

The firm "Kolben and Companions" was founded in 1896 by Emil Kolben, an employee of Edison himself, the chief engineer of Ed! Sop CE Co. Produces hydro turbines, equipment for hydroelectric power plants.

When CKD was formed, the staff was 12,000 people. In the 1930s, the output of military products was constantly growing. During the occupation, most of the production was transferred to the supplies of the German army.

126

As a result of the Allied air attack in March 1945, about 70% of the buildings and 50% of the machinery were damaged.

All of the above is only a small part and only of the Czech-Moravian armored registry. Dig further and can't get away from the mention of the amazing Czech tank G.T-38, on the basis of which the engineers of the MVB (former Praga plants) and Skoda developed the Merder self-propelled gun and, as recognized by experts, is the best anti-tank self-propelled gun of that war "Hertzer". Its circulation of 2584 pieces is an "excellent result" for this genre.

What else is important to say about the nature of relations in that "United Europe" of 1938-1945? The level of Hitler's violence—perhaps there will still be many attempts to even exaggerate it in order to hide behind it, to hide a share, a slice of completely market relations. It was in Auschwitz and Majdanek that shackles rang, and in "United Europe" coins rang. Denmark, Norway, the Czech Republic, France received not only orders, but also orders. And the prospect, the "Great Plan", Hitler describes to his closest associates as follows:

"Führer's Table Talk. October 13, 1941:

Those countries that we invite to participate in our economic system will have their share of the natural wealth of the Russian regions. On an economic level, America has never

will become a partner of European countries. The Danube is the river of the future. We will connect it with the Dnieper and the Don. Europe, not America, will become a country of unlimited possibilities... And Ukrainian manganese is also important for America."

That is, the Fuhrer, speaking in a modern way, was still a "marketer". Even to his most insignificant counterparties, he showed not only a stick, but also a carrot.

Indirect evidence, and even taken from some unexpected areas, is good because it is fundamentally unfalsifiable. They seem to inadvertently give a picture, or rather, the very edge of the picture, but the accustomed eye finishes the rest.

Approximately the same is meant by Plutarch in his immortal "Comparative Lives", in the introduction to "Alexander the Great":

127

"... and it is not always in the most glorious deeds that virtue or viciousness is visible, but often some insignificant deed, word or joke reveals a person's character better than battles where tens of thousands die ..."

Here is my illustration of the fact that violence in Hitler's Europe was not absolute, but conditional, carefully groping for its acceptable levels.

The Fuhrer issued a series of anti-Jewish laws, instructions requiring, in particular, to remove all monuments to Jews in the Reich. There was a monument to the composer Mendelssohn in Leipzig, and the burgomaster [erderleau] forbade it to be removed. He, the burgomaster, enjoyed great respect in the city, so the Nazis did not dare to dismiss him. And the monument stood. But one day [erderleo went on vacation and left Leipzig for a while. And his deputy immediately ordered the removal of Mendelssohn.

Returning, the burgomaster ordered the monument to be erected again. And then Gerderleo was already removed from his post, sent to a concentration camp, and then executed. (Well, the monument, of course, was thrown down again on the very first day.) Here they are, different degrees of violence. Violence, tentatively defining, searching for its boundaries: the burgomaster, supported by all the cumulative authority of the city of Leipzig, could not remove the monument to a Jew. But he could no longer raise.

The second example is about German politeness. More specifically, about the greeting, the Hitler salute.

If anyone looks into the "Directive on the Hitler salute", he will know that, it turns out, there were two different "heils":

"When meeting persons belonging to the same social group, it is recommended to raise the outstretched right hand at such an angle that the face can be seen from under the palm. This gesture should be accompanied by the words "Heil [itler!" or at least "Heil!". If someone greets a friend from a greater distance, it is enough to raise their hand in the manner described. .

If you meet a person standing with a public or other (highlighted by me. - I.Sh.) point of view below, you should raise your right hand vertically at eye level and at the same time say: "Heil Hitler!"

128

This "below from a public or other point of view" is very interesting. Other, not social - this is meant from a racial "point of view below". That is, it was also provided for a separate form of saluting the French, Dutch, Czechs, etc.

And after all, this manifestation of German courtesy and pedantry in relation to lower-ranking employees is also indirect evidence of the presence of the same thing! in the Third Reich.

Chapter 11

MAIN "MUNICH" OF CZECH HISTORY

Anyone who has looked at European maps of different eras remembers a large country in the very center of Europe, whose outlines resembled the stretched skin of some animal. It was usually hatched in gray tones, sometimes green. Although its outlines and names changed: the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the famous "patchwork empire of the Habsburgs". Czech Republic, the main economic engine of the empire, in the name, in the "title", not according to never fell.

If you move back along this complex historical dotted line: Soviet tanks in Prague-1968 - Czech tanks in Russia - 1941-1944 - The Shame of Munich - First Czechoslovakia ... and at the same time try to comprehend some patterns of Czech history, you will still inevitably run into the Habsburg Empire and, further, to the Holy Roman Empire.

So, Charlemagne was the first to reproduce the Ancient Roman (Western) Empire approximately within the old borders, but already in the Christian world. By 924, the empire had virtually collapsed on its own, the Saxon duke Otto revived it in 962. Czecho-Moravia is an indispensable and increasingly powerful member of this motley community. The dynasties of emperors changed: Saxon, Salic, Hohenstaufen... The dynastic principle was successfully combined with the election of the emperor. The college of these electors, electors, including

129

Chala five to seven largest princes of the empire. But the Habsburgs at that time were petty, petty landowners. And not in the southeastern (where Austria) corner of the empire, but in the southwestern (where Alsace is). Built in the upper reaches of the Rhine around 1020-1040, the "Hawk Castle" (Nas Bige, Habichtsburg, later transferred to Habsburg) was not included in the "first hundred" princely castles of the empire. When the last of the Hohenstaufen died, the most likely candidate was the Bohemian king Przemysl Otokar II. "King of iron and gold", so called for military power and wealth, he also owned parts of Hungary, Croatia and Slovenia. Having also united Austria in 1250, Przemysl Otokar II became the most powerful monarch, the undisputed "leader" of the empire, and his personal possessions surprisingly resembled the outlines of the very country from which the Habsburgs would remain at the end of their history, in 1918. But here's an even more unique coincidence. The history of the Czech Republic in our country is divided and decomposed into such different shelves that such a comparison has never been discussed before.

"DOUBLE MUNICH" TO PSHEMYSL OTOKAR III!

It looks a bit like shouting in a bar: "Double Munich! Double Manhattan! — but the originality of this subtitle in no way overshadows the fidelity of this historical parallel. "Munich" - of course, since 1938 - a synonym for dirty betrayal. But why "double"?

Przemysl Otokar II was betrayed twice. At first, in 1273, his fellow electors did not elect him emperor. Many promised, swore, but... in the end, they were afraid of the power of the Czech. They chose, on the contrary, the weakest of the candidates, Rudolf Habsburg the First. Everyone called that option intermediate. Something similar happens in the election of popes, when the cardinals argue for a long time, come to a standstill and choose the oldest of the candidates in order to "return to the question" soon.

But Rudolf Habsburg turned out to be just a unique figure, the founder of a dynasty that lasted 650 years. On

130

Poleon, in moments of intoxication with his dynastic plans, said: "I myself am Rudolf the First Habsburg of my dynasty."

But what about the "second Munich" of Przemysl II?

Ask any of the historians about the most significant battle in the history of the Czech Republic - and 99% will name the Battle of the White Mountain, 1620. The beginning of the Thirty Years' War and the end of Czech independence - this era will also be touched upon.

But what happened in 1278 deserves more attention. A kind of unique betrayal, ingrained in the very fabric of Czech history.

The Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire was an honorary figure (the main monarch of the Christian world), but often completely powerless. Weaker than many of his virtually independent vassals, he relied mainly on his personal possessions, and Rudolf Habsburg, as we remember, was elected for the modesty of such. But Rudolph nevertheless decided to go to war with Przemysl Otokar, and on August 26, 1278, this amazing battle took place on the Moravian field. The most powerful army of Przemysl could have defeated Rudolf, but the traitorous conspirators killed their commander-in-chief, and the Czech army dispersed. Believe me: in the correct European, HEEA Asian wars - this (the transition of part of the army to the side of the enemy and the murder of one's commander) is a rare case. The Przemyslov dynasty ended shortly thereafter, but the most important thing was that the Habsburgs received, took away their main "historical base", Austria and Vienna, from the Przemyslows.

And the first region where the Habsburgs' aggressive gaze was cast after that was, of course, the Czech Republic. True, the streak of their first successes soon ended, the "spiral of history" made many more turns before the Habsburgs got the Czech Republic. The descendants of Rudolf for a long historical period also lost the imperial crown. For all 650 years of historical pulsations, Austria, taken from Przemysl, was the only firm one that belonged to them.

And the Czechs had another period of intellectual and military "all-European" takeoff. We are talking, of course, about Jan Hus (high intellectual, religious, moral impulse) and his Hussites (military). BUT... and then it all ended with "Munich", "Munich"...

131

"Munich" of the 15th century was located in Constance – Jan Hus was summoned to the church council there with all possible written guarantees of immunity, letters, including those from Emperor Sigismund of Luxembourg (so Chamberlain's guarantees have a rich background). The theological disputes were short-lived: Jan Hus was captured and on July 6, 1415 burned at the stake.

So much has been said about the famous Hussites, "Taborites", who bravely and successfully resisted the aggression of almost all of Europe... One can only add that even in the middle of the 20th century, Soviet boys played "Taborites".

(The author of this book is a witness himself and an ardent participant who built the "Wagenburg" - the Hussite mobile camp - from carts and vegetable boxes.)

Invincible, holding the whole of Europe in fear, the Taborites fell victim to the intrigues of Sigismund, the pope, and mainly the Bohemian German nobles and townspeople (a pure analogue of the "Sudet Germans" of 1938). At Lipany in 1436, the Czechs were already fighting among themselves. And the result: the traitor of Hus, long rejected by the whole of the Czech Republic, Sigismund Luxembourg returns as king to Prague...

But let's not make history fit the scheme: after the Konstanz and Lipan "Munich", the Hussites were able to present Europe with another big surprise, comparable to the triumphal campaigns of the Taborites throughout Europe (and this is almost completely said in our popular historiography). - tea). Suddenly, the almost destroyed Hussites nominated a new leader: George (Yuri)

Podebrada, and he captured Prague for several years in 1448, became regent, and in 1458 - king (the first and only Hussite king in the Czech Republic). A unique personality in Medieval Europe: the only commoner to achieve kingship, to force the pope and the emperor to recognize himself, and to intermarry with several royal houses...

Again, the Czech Republic came to the forefront of history during the first of the great all-European wars. The famous Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) and the Peace of Westphalia that ended it opened the era in which we are believed to live today. The very idea of "national sovereignties" has a precisely defined date of birth: October 24, 1648, the day the Peace of Westphalia was concluded.

132

AMATEUR INQUIRIES Why was there a lot of talk about the Westphalian period in 1999?

But because Clinton and Madeleine Albright, then starting a war against Serbia, tried to substantiate it fundamentally new in international law: "The primacy of "universal values" over national sovereignty." It was then that international lawyers started talking about a possible "end of the Westphalian period" and the beginning of some new period in history. And the fact that today those "common human values" are remembered no more often than ... "the blue dress of Monica Lewinsky" (and in approximately similar colors) shows the seriousness, the non-randomness of the "Westphalian" turn of human history.

This very important war in the history of mankind is divided by scientists into 4 periods, depending on the main Habsburg rival at that time: 1) Czech, 2) Danish, 3) Swedish, 4) French.

The Thirty Years' War began in Prague, when the Czechs refused to recognize another Habsburg as the heir to the Czech throne. And on May 22, 1618, the rebellious people subjected the imperial governors to the "Czech execution" - defenestration. (Defenestration, execution by throwing out of a window, is a Czech invention. [D]o apparently, this is due to the success of high-rise building in Prague.)

The Czechs elected their king, the Protestant Frederick of the Palatinate, but in 1620, in the same battle at the White Mountain, they were defeated and lost their independence for 300 years! Here is the irony! The Thirty Years' War gave independence to the Netherlands, Switzerland and almost fifty German principalities, but the Czechs, who started this great struggle, on the contrary, took it away.

Only the collapse of the Habsburg Empire in 1918 and the creation of Czechoslovakia restored the sovereignty of this nation... For a completely Alexander-Dumovian period of twenty years...

What the world remembered in 1938 as an unimaginable kaleidoscope of diplomatic intrigues and soundings by Halifax, Ciano and Bonnet, political statements and denials by Benes, Chamberlain and Daladier, rushing from Moscow to Washington, Hitler called it briefly: plan "/ run >.

133

After the Anschluss of Austria, Czechoslovakia may have looked on the maps as a defenseless, semi-encircled country. But this is only for those who like looking at the "political maps of Europe" alone. Anyone who takes the trouble to look at physical maps will be convinced that the brown places between the Czech Republic and Germany are not from the "brown plague of fascism". These are mountains. Border ranges Sumava, Bohemian Forest, Ore Mountains, Sudetenland. In all conscience, they cannot be called impassable. The last (until Munich-1938) who broke through these ridges was Moltke the Elder, who defeated the Austro-Hungarians (and non-titular, mostly ordinary Czechs) in 1866 at the Battle of Sadovaya. BUT the twentieth century has made its own adjustments. The main thing is that the Czechs have strengthened. It was the combination of the mountainous terrain and modern fortification that made it possible to create this

a unique line, immeasurably superior to all those famous Maginots and Siegfrieds. The second factor: in the Wehrmacht in 1938, the main stake was placed on tank and motorized units. But what gave advantages on the fields of Poland and France was, on the contrary, a significant disadvantage in the Ore and Sudeten Mountains. We remember the conclusion of the German generals, who later studied the Czech fortifications: "Never, not during the entry of German troops into the Rhineland and the Ruhr area, not during the Anschluss of Austria, not even during the attack on Poland in 1939 and on France in 1940 -m - there has never been such a risk of defeat. Partly, the Czech mountain fortifications were impregnable, partly, they required more than six months of assault and a completely different (missing from Hitler) artillery to break through.

From the testimonies at the Nuremberg trials, it is known that the German generals categorically objected to Hitler's plan to break through the Sudeten fortifications, since this task seemed to them an unachievable military. Wilhelm Keitel testified:

"We were extraordinarily glad that it did not come to a military operation, because ... we have always been of the opinion that our offensive means are not enough to storm the border installations of Czechoslovakia. From a purely military point of view, we simply did not have the means for an attack that would break like a wave against a breakwater of the border fortifications in the Sudetes (...)"

134

Now to find out why this most perfect defensive system was never tested in practice?

[The main political tool for breaking into Czechoslovakia was the Sudeten Germans led by Henlein. As you can easily guess, they lived in the Sudeten mountains. And that is why all the talk (mostly English) about the possibility of transferring these areas to Germany "in exchange for peace and guarantees" is a very special level of cynicism and betrayal. The Sudeten mountain fortified area was a material (and 100%!) guarantee of Czech security! And the British offered to exchange it - for another guarantee, a verbal contractual one - at home (this will be evidenced) - recognizing (in the person of Minister of War Hor-Belish) that Britain does not have any opportunities (and desires!) back up these guarantees with something!

Hitler created a political leadership obedient to him in the Sudetenland, whose leader Konrad Henlein defined his task as follows:

"We must always demand so much that our demands cannot be met."

Tenlein demanded that the municipal elections scheduled for May 22, 1938 be counted as a referendum on joining Germany. The President of Czechoslovakia, Benes, announced a partial mobilization, and the May crisis passed quite happily for the Czechs. Henlein fled to Germany.

(An interesting fact came across to me in Helmont's World History of Mankind, the Russian edition of 1904: earlier the Sudeten Mountains were called the Giant Mountains. More precisely, both the Sudetenland and the Giants stood out at that time. Later, a unification took place under the first of the names. It turns out that the disputed national minority can also be called ... 'giant Germans'.)

The next stage of pressure can be considered the trip of Hitler's personal adjutant Wiedemann to London and his negotiations with the head of the Foreign Office, Lord Halifax. This was followed by meetings of the Fuhrer himself with Prime Minister Chamberlain

Why were the British treated in the first place? Czechoslovakia had a mutual assistance agreement with France and the USSR

and the French asked for British assistance in persuading the Czechs to cede the Sudetenland. Wiedemann left interesting notes (published in English as Ruzhe Pares, they are in the US Library of Congress). So, the British "wait and believe": the big negotiations will finally appease Hitler, "canalize" the energy and dynamics of the Reich.

Wiedemann: "The Fuhrer will start full-scale negotiations with Great Britain and conclude a long-term agreement – but only after the resolution of the Central European problem (the annexation of the Sudetenland, as follows from the context of the conversation. — I.Sh.)."

Halifax: "Tell him (the Fuhrer) that I hope to live to see the main goal of my efforts come true: to see Adolf Hitler with the King of England on the balcony of Buckingham Palace!"

What pathos! Here, in my opinion, there is room even for purely Freudian studies. This exit to the "balcony". As you know, the main, central love scene in the plot of Shakespeare's play "Romeo and Juliet" is the famous "scene on the balcony". And a lord brought up on Shakespeare could have images... and so on.

Wiedemann retells Halifax's ideas this way: "Bombs on Prague are war. We need a different tactic in Czechoslovakia. No shots needed - choke them."

Of course, it is too big a responsibility to rely on a matter of such importance (the diplomatic strategy of Great Britain in 1938) only on Wiedemann's notes. But here is the opinion of the German ambassador in London, Dirksen: "The British wanted to resolve the issue in stages: from autonomy to a plebiscite, from a plebiscite to secession (Sudet). But on the condition that there are no violent acts of Germany disturbing public opinion."

AMATEUR INQUIRIES

And who, exactly?

And who, in fact, betrayed the Czech Republic? Britain or the British government of Chamberlain?

In other cases, dividing the country and the government is pure sophistry, but right there, clearly, at every step, one can see the fears of what is most terrible for Halifax: the fall of the cabinet,

resignations. "The first bomb - and the war." That is, an intermediate link was lowered: the first bomb - and ... Churchill would come (a year earlier), and then there would really be war (he would not stand on ceremony and draw "love scenes under the balcony"!). Only it was necessary to risk this "first bomb" ...

Dirksen's colleague, British Ambassador to Prague Newton adds historical conceptualization: "Czechoslovakia is an artificial creation that has no roots in the past." And, as is probably meant, "having no right to the future."

There is no need to remind once again about the measure of influence in Britain and the world of the London newspaper The Times. And here is a photocopy of its issue dated September 7, 1938 with an article by the then editor-in-chief Dawson, one should have in every Czech museum:

"We recommend accepting proposals whose aim is to make the Czech Republic a more homogeneous state, by separating from it a population alien to it, living in the neighborhood of a people with whom it is connected by racial ties."

Official statement from London on September 18, 1938: "It is necessary to give (to Germany) those areas where the Germans are more than 50% of the total population. Without this, the guarantees of the Czech Republic in its new

boundaries." It is perfectly complemented by the admission the next day (September 19) of the British Minister of War Hore-Belish: "We have no means of fulfilling our guarantees." (That is, bolder, Adolf!)

The British ambassador in London (this is already a kind of RK-arrangement): "If excuses are needed before certain circles, who regard this as a shameful capitulation to German threats, then this can be explained by our constant adherence to the principle of self-determination of nations."

The final assessment - albeit not the most senior person, but only the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs (Halifax) O. Harvey: "In fact, we presented an ultimatum to the Czechs for Germany>.

On September 22, Goji's agrarian government resigned. General Syrový, who became the head of the cabinet, announced mobile

137

zation. Outwardly, these measures seem quite worthy, but ... the inner essence of the action can be completely different. So the word "mobilization" can mean that 2 million Czechs (this is the size of their mobilized army) will receive rifles and will wait in their uniquely fortified passes for 2.2 million Germans (and this is the full strength of the German army). Or maybe "mobilization" also means a simple verbal argument to try to bargain for at least something else in the London hallway of the Foreign Office.

Reference:

By the autumn of 1938, Germany had brought the size of the army to 2 million 200 thousand people, with 720 tanks and 2500 aircraft. The mobilized armed forces of Czechoslovakia numbered 2 million soldiers and officers, with 469 tanks and 1582 aircraft. This army was based on powerful defensive structures and could well provide more than worthy resistance, but gave up the country without a fight.

AMATEUR INQUIRIES How, in fact, was everything in this Munich?

Just a couple more lines can be added to the history of the last "Munich days" itself.

Once an Englishman, a Frenchman, a German and an Italian gathered in Munich (quite an anecdotal beginning), and the German immediately announced that his troops would enter the Sudetenland regardless of the negotiations: | October (every other day). And on the night of the 1930s, an Englishman, a Frenchman, a German and an Italian signed an agreement that, indeed, "let him in." And the Czech representatives were indeed waiting in the hallway. And also a German and an Englishman, in the same place, in Munich, since they had already arrived, signed a separate agreement, which some corrosive historians call "the actual German-British non-aggression pact"...

And it is also known that three days before, on September 26, a German received a letter from an American (President Roosevelt) with one very interesting phrase, which, in general, had nothing to do with Munich, but was still a very important phrase, which we will consider in the chapter "The Law of the Great War".

Of course, this anecdotal version of the "Munich Summit" cannot be limited. Here are eyewitness accounts

138

Hitler's translator, Schmidt (although it is possible that in this chronicle you will feel something anecdotal):

"... in Munich there was also a small skirmish with Chamberlain. He insistently raised one issue, which, on the whole, did not matter much. It concerned the transfer to Germany of Czechoslovak public property in the ceded territory. Chamberlain persistently sought an answer to the question of who would compensate the Czechoslovak government for the cost of buildings and structures that would pass to Germany along with the territory of the Sudetenland. It was obvious that in this case it was not the prime minister and politician who was speaking, but the former finance minister and business man. Hitler became more and more restless. Finally, Hitler exploded. "Our time is too precious to be wasted on such trivialities!" he called to Chamberlain. This happened when Chamberlain, to top it off, also raised the question of whether the cattle would remain in the Sudeten territory, or whether a certain amount of livestock should not be taken to the territory that would remain from Czechoslovakia ...

The draft agreement proposed by Mussolini was meanwhile translated into the three languages of the conference, and on its basis, with a few minor changes, the famous Munich Agreement was worked out, which was finally signed between 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning on September 30. .

Around nine o'clock in the evening, Hitler invited everyone to dine with him in the banquet hall. Chamberlain and Daladier apologized, saying they had to call their governments; they were clearly not in the mood to attend a banquet. They secured peace, but at the cost of a serious loss of prestige. Under pressure from Hitler, they came to an agreement that an ally of France should cede part of its territory to Germany. As we now know, both France and England had to put considerable pressure on Czechoslovakia, so it was quite understandable that Chamberlain and Daladier looked very depressed that evening.

Consequently, an exclusively Italo-German company sat with Hitler at the same banquet table, which turned out to be quite long. It was then that Mussolini made his statement about the possibility of catastrophic consequences for Italy during the Abyssinian War if the League of Nations extended its oil sanctions even for just one week (...).".

139

That is, a little earlier, Ethiopia had its own "Munich".

On September 30, the Czech army began to retreat from the Sudetenland. The mountain citadels, large industrial centers, which formed the basis of the country's defense power, were leaving. And Hitler, having annexed the Sudetenland, presented Czechoslovakia with a new list of demands. And again staged incidents, spreading rumors about the persecution of the German ethnic minority, which now remained in the truncated territory of Czechoslovakia. On March 15, 1939, the Germans entered the rest of Czechoslovakia. Deprived of fortified defensive lines, the Czechs were unable to resist. Hitler said: "From the very beginning it was clear to me that I could not be content with German territory in the Sudetenland. It was only a partial solution..."

So much has been said and written about all the collisions of that same Franco-Czech-Soviet union treaty that if a middle-aged person now gives up everything and only studies memoirs and dissertations on this topic, he will be provided with reading for two lives ahead.

It is only important to repeat the generally accepted:

a) the French tried with all their might to avoid the fulfillment of the main, final clause of the treaty: the provision of military assistance. Their requests for English mediation and Daladier's final signature in Munich are the seal of Cain in indelible ink;

6) the Czech Republic itself refused Soviet military assistance - for fear of not being able to cope without simultaneous French support.

Thank God, these facts have not yet been disputed by anyone, they are only hushed up. And for the sake of complete fairness, it must be admitted that the military aid of the Soviet Union on the strategic scales of 1938 really meant less than the French. Even much less - but not because of the lack of determination of the Soviet government, but only because of the remoteness, lack of a common border with Germany and the extremely vile position of the Polish government of Beck (a categorical ban on the passage of Soviet troops, up to the threat of war). In March 1939, Poland will receive from the Czech heritage the highly developed Teszyn district, as an encouragement to Hitler for this

140

service, and literally six months later, in September of the same year, he will receive everything else due.

They try to devalue the Soviet resolve of 1938 by the future Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, but this is a real trick. There is such a category of tricks based on the features of optical perception ("This ball seems to you larger than this - and if you measure it ..."). From 2006, indeed, 1938 and 1939 seem to be one day. But in fact, in 1938, the USSR was still waging a real war with [Hitler on the fields of Spain, and victory there remained in doubt for a long time. A similar war (aviation, sending a corps through Rumania) and with much greater intensity (correction for proximity) could have been waged in Czechoslovakia even under the Polish blockade.

As early as September 17, 1938, Czech Foreign Minister Kroft admitted: "The USSR is doing more for Czechoslovakia than can be demanded under the treaty."

But in the Russian-Czech plot of 1938 there are also unique twists... General Sergei Nikolaevich Voitsekhovskiy is a member of the White movement. It was his troops who took Yekaterinburg in July 1918, a few days after the assassination of the royal family. But (perhaps the psychological oppression of a fratricidal war becomes unbearable) General Voitsekhovskiy soon leaves for the Czech Republic to create an army of a new Slavic state. "I worked for my new homeland on the border of physical possibilities," said Czech historian Jiří Fidler. It was the commander of the Prague military district, General Wojciechowski, who created that unique fortified Sudetenland line. According to the memoirs of the Czechoslovak diplomat Jaromir Smutny, on September 30, 1938, at a meeting with the president with the participation of politicians and the army command, it was decided to accept the conditions of Munich. Of those present at the meeting, besides Smutny himself, only the head of the presidential office, Prokop Drtina, and General Voitsekhovskiy spoke out in favor of resistance...

In August 2008, I was lucky enough to meet the great-niece of General Voitsekhovskiy, Tatyana Temnikova, who lives in the United States. She said that the descendants of the hero of Russia and Czechoslovakia are alive and carefully keep his archive...

141

Against the surrender to Hitler, another Russian who lived in the Czech Republic for a long time also rebelled ... Marina Tsvetaeva:

...God! Bohemia! Don't lie like a layer! God gave both

And will give again! ..

"God gave with both" (to give with both hands means, according to the proverb, to bestow generously). Tsvetaeva literally bothered them, believing in the fate of a generously gifted people...

The most unpleasant (and false) interpretation of this book for the author is the "anti-Czech pamphlet". Selective, bad-faith quoting may present the matter in this way, so...

Proactive comment

Indeed, the main attention in the unfolding of the world war is given to the Czech Republic. Attention is focused not only on the fact that this was the largest military and economic "gift" [to Hitler, but also on the fact that then, in 1938, he was closest to defeat and overthrow. The well-known "strike" (in the words of Marabini) of one part of the German army and the readiness for an uprising of another was due, among other things, to the realization of the unreality of the task ahead: an attempt to break through the fortified Sudeten Mountains.

Here is a turn of history that turns the Czech tragedy into a global one.

It was the realization by the German military of the UNREALITY of a MILITARY victory over the Czech Republic and the inadmissibility of war that led to the creation of a military opposition ("which fired" only in 1944).

That is, [Hitler and Chamberlain were able, figuratively speaking, to show the German military bores and pedants language ...

There can be only one objection: the British are free to give security guarantees to the Czechs, they are free to take them back. After all, as their fundamental foreign policy postulate says, "England has no permanent allies, England has permanent interests." But the fact is that in Munich they told the Czechs not this, but something quite different: "Give up the Sudetenland, and within the new borders you will receive new guarantees."

142

The first bomb on Prague was more feared by Chamberlain and Halifax than by the Czechs, because "they're over the mountains, maybe they'll sit it out, and our cabinet will definitely be resigned." Actually, this political prediction of Chamberlain was correct. When the real war started, they really were dismissed and Churchill was appointed. And not by the ability to military leadership.

Just Churchill, the Minister of the Navy, himself and immediately lost big in Norway. But, probably, what is required of the prime minister in such an era is not military skill, but only the determination to fight. Plus "cleanliness". Chamberlain was responsible not only for Munich, but also for all that deceitful politically correct atmosphere, for the sake of maintaining which (just for an extra twenty weeks!) Czechoslovakia was "torn apart". After all, the Czechs were explained that, stubbornly over the Sudetenland, they oppose NOT ONLY Germany, but also the entire European harmony, world public opinion... A country that embarked on this path would turn into a pariah state, speaking already in modern terms. And the eventual acceptance of help from another pariah, the Soviet Union, would only add to the Czech challenge and guilt. If the Czechs did not have English guarantees at all, they most likely would have held out. This, of course, is the very subjunctive mood that "history does not tolerate", but still a combination of two factors - a certain military advantage (2 million in mountain fortresses is five times stronger than 2.2 million stormers) plus the willingness of the Wehrmacht to overthrow Hitler, as the Wehrmacht, in alliance with [Hitler, liquidated the SA] four years before, add up to making such an outcome the most likely.

Churchill just fiercely criticized that policy, realizing the negligible price of the then European consent. It also points to the most important starting point of that "European era", sliding into a new war: 1925, the Locarno conference, for which the first Chamberlain – Austin – received the Order of the Garter and the Nobel Peace Prize. The Munich of the second Chamberlain—Neville—simply resulted from that policy, bringing it to understandable consequences.

Even if the British policy were openly pro-German, it would be easier for the Czechs to prepare for war. So Przemysl Odokar on the Moravian field - remember? – he would certainly have preferred that the allies who attacked him from behind would have been better on the side of the Habsburgs at the beginning of the battle...

143

The nation of Jan Hus and Georgy Podebrad was betrayed by the Europe of Knights of the Order of the Garter and Nobel Peace Prize winners.

Well, fellow Slavs, we too were betrayed by a Nobel Peace Prize winner. And recently, in 2005, this famous bribe was reserved for Yushchenko as well. But - he didn't justify it! Or the stimulation of the atomic El Baradei seemed more important at that political moment...

That would be a great topic for a journalistic investigation. Nobel Prizes, as you know, are paid with interest. The Board of Trustees invested the legacy of the inventor of dynamite in some large, profitable and, most importantly, sustainable business. Real estate and minerals best meet all three criteria. (And there was no Norwegian oil in the 1930s.) And if... it turns out that this "investment of Nobel capital" is the extraction and transportation of Scandinavian iron ore, then the whole story will simply take on classical completeness and clarity. Then the entire trajectory of the Swedish iron, down to the fragments in the bodies of war veterans, and gold, up to the pockets of Chamberlain and Gorbachev, will become visibly visible.

Chapter 12 HOW MANY COLUMNS WAS IT?

The main theme, the main term of this book - "The Great War", "The Law of the Great War", which cancels the "Clausewitz Postulate" (on "the continuation of politics by other means") - I intend to illustrate with all the examples available to me, to reveal with all possible methods, including the method of contradiction, giving examples of "small wars". The "Big War" begins when the "Big Enemy" is identified, and ends with its complete annihilation. But in this historical period with very blurred boundaries (especially the lower one), a lot happens, including individual private wars, which, due to the tension of forces, the mutual fury of the parties and, as a result, the level of "politeness", the level of compliance with the written and unwritten rules are very different from their contemporary "Big War".

144

Ironically speaking, those waging these little wars of their own can even be "proud" before the participants of the "Big" of their politeness, moderation, in short, the whole set of qualities that today is summed up as political correctness. But the main irony is that they are really proud of "their small" wars, they impose their own standards, rules for assessing the nature and consequences of the "Big". Let's say Denmark. Several hours of resistance. As the commander of the invading German corps, General Kaupisch, reported: "They (the Danes) took their breath away from our pace." Humane formulation. Note that these words would be completely suitable for describing, say, a football match "Germany - Denmark - 9:0". However, with any description of the hostilities, even with this one, one cannot fall into an insulting tone, indiscriminately declaring: "Everyone has surrendered!" You can not forget, ignore that not all. The personal guards of the royal palace of Amalienburg were not afraid to open fire.

The hopelessness of their resistance only underscores their personal heroism. The capture of the entire country cost the Germans 20 killed, the Danes - 36 killed. And almost all the dead are Amalienburg. (According to other sources, there are two Germans who died during the capture of Denmark. And the difference is the added dead in the subsequent period.)

The Norwegians resisted much longer, but they were helped by the landscape of the country, and the English landings, and the fleet. The Dutch are closer to the Danish version. Belgians are closer to Norwegian. Luxembourg - two wounded (probably someone slipped).

And all these blitzkriegs, including French (where the resistance was, of course, much stronger than in Belgium or Norway), and all these blitzkriegs gave rise, and immediately, in "real time", either suspicion or this, not a myth. "Fifth column"!

AMATEUR INQUIRIES And why, in fact, the fifth? Does this have to do with the "fifth angle"?

"The Fifth Column" is generally one of the leitmotifs of the descriptions of the Second World War. It was the unusual nature of the invasions, the pace of the Nazi offensives that gave rise to the following version:

The Fifth Column is to blame.

145

And this term was born during the war in Spain in 1936-1939. When the Franco fascists launched an attack on Madrid in four columns, suspicions flashed in the world press that an armed uprising by Franco's supporters in Madrid itself was also being prepared - and this would be the most dangerous, "fifth" column. The fears of the time were only partly justified. But that was a civil war. And besides, let's clarify, it was already the Soviet-German-Italian war plus the Spanish civil war. (This is for admirers of the historical Bukovo-Rezunov "fantasy" about Stalin instructing [Hitler].) In civil wars, treachery, stabbings in the back, and "fifth columns" are not uncommon.

But after Spain, of all the partial wars of the Second World War, only the Yugoslav war was clearly a civil one, and the ghost of the "fifth column" "wandered around Europe" ... just like a hundred years before, another well-known "ghost" ...

Then they pointed to two objects, to two sources of threat. First, there were significant German communities in several countries. Secondly, there was (more precisely, it was suspected that it existed as a kind of similarity to the Comintern, the Socialist International, the Profintern...) still a fascist international.

And there were also two reasons for maintaining the "five-column" idea in the public mind, two reasons for the high convertibility of this version. The first I named: the need to explain my rapid defeats.

Second: maintaining "high vigilance" among those who decided to avoid defeat.

I will save my political "interest" for later, and first I will give the opinion of an independent researcher on this topic. Historian Louis de Jong, author of *The Fifth Column in Western Europe*, has collected considerable material, and his conclusion; The "fifth column" had almost no influence on the course of hostilities in Western Europe. His dossier contains hundreds of facts like this: all the newspapers repeated that German ships entered the Oslo Fjord only because "someone's vile hand cut the electric cable undermining the minefields." So, de Jong finds out, there were no combat-ready minefields there at all.

Belgium really did have its own fascists, Leon Degrel's "Rexist", but it turns out they almost ignored them.

146

get rid of Hitler, and some small money (Louis de Jong also gives figures - about 20-30 thousand dollars!) and instructions were accepted only from Mussolini. But Italy, at the time the Germans passed through Belgium, was not yet at war, and did not issue any "sabotage, sabotage instructions" to the Rexist.

The German communities (with one exception) were also not involved in practical military tasks. Hitler's main concern was that foreign Germans become fully Nazis, the conductors of his policy in these regions after the conquest.

This is another one - which already counts! - an example of "the strength of European resistance to Hitlerism." It only needs to be understood correctly: Hitler did not want to exchange these trump cards, the German communities, for actual military undermining, for the success of conquering these countries! With this, he decided, he could handle it himself. BUT... for the subsequent integration, fascistization of Europe, these communities are important, and therefore it is necessary to save them, not exchanging them for hostilities!

Well, as for this single exception (the use of the "fifth column" to seize the country), I again "take the floor". Of course, these are my "favorite" Sudeten Germans.

"Giant Germans", according to the old name I found for the Sudeten Mountains. This community really played a significant role in the conquest of Czechoslovakia.

Hitler created in the Sudetenland an obedient political leadership, whose leader, Konrad Henlein, defined his task as follows:

"We must always demand so much that our demands cannot be met."

We remember that when, during the May crisis of 1938, the President of Czechoslovakia, Beneš, announced a partial mobilization and arrested several German hooligans, Henlein fled to Germany. By the way, towards the end of this epic, Hitler was already planning to replace the insufficiently aggressive Henlein with another "giant German" - Frank. So the Anglo-French betrayal in Munich saved not only Hitler, but also (at the micro level) the career of a certain "giant German Henlein", already forgotten today. And in general -

147

the only successful Nazi "fifth column" was the Sudeten German. And that was only because she had such "column-drivers": Chamberlain, Halifax, Daladier.

Well, in general, the "fifth column" as it was born on the pages of newspapers in 1937, so basically there (in the newspapers) and marched. So what else, what other "political interest" draws my attention to this topic?!

Yes, all the same! I have such a suspicion or, say, a feeling that the "fifth column" is also a kind of justification, an argument in post-war disputes like these "certificates about the country's participation in the resistance movement". This is an attempt to rationalize the "Great War", adapt it, model it, decompose it into a sum of easily explainable fragments.

I explain. We can say, for example, to the Danes:

(1). There was a "Big War", but you were excluded from its participants within an hour and a half. Of the participants in the struggle against Hitler, for whom you then worked for four and a half years.

To this they, the Danes, may try to answer:

(2) No! It was an ordinary, correct war

+ terrible "fifth column" (due to which our country only held out for an hour and a half)

+ our "valiant resistance"!

Bringing everything to the equation of "conventional war" with the help of these two constants, they remain correctly fought. And who fought wrong? UK and USSR. Great Britain, as already mentioned, without declaring war, seized Iceland in 1940, then part of Denmark. Just so that together with the rest of Denmark Germany does not get. This was justified: if Iceland were German, not a single Anglo-American convoy would have reached Murmansk.

BUT! The rules of the "correct war" were then violated!

And the USSR also cleaned up part of Poland and the Baltic states. And inevitably, sooner or later, but the account "from the right to the wrong" will be presented.

So far, only Lithuania is trying to present formal legal, financial claims against Russia. The rest of the Balts, Czech Republic, Poland, Finland, United (again) Europe in

represented by the Council of Europe and PACE are next in line.

148

REVANSHISTS FOUND IN A SERIOUSLY UNUSUAL ANGLE

Of course, all of the above countries and organizations are a kind of convention. This refers to individual parties, factions, individuals within them. As, for example, not the whole of Finland, but a separate specially created society, demands the seizure of Karelia from the "Russian aggressor". And the "Lithuanian accounts", sitting in Vilnius, which was donated twice (in 1940 and 1945), are mainly issued by the party of Landsbergis. And in Estonia, not all public organizations in the country, but only Kaistelit, were involved in the transfer of border posts. It was in the period of 1992-1994, when our border with Estonia was not yet guarded, the "Kaistelites" carried it 5 kilometers to the west, moving new border pillars and "capturing" our Ivangorod at the same time ...

"Katyn", "Prague Tanks-68" are also the object of work of not all the "public" of the respective countries ...

But what term, what general name can be given to all these groups, parties, factions? Not a superficial nickname, not an offensive nickname, namely, an objective definition. Thinking about this led me to one very strange conclusion at first glance. If we sum up their programs and slogans, they will be, strictly speaking, revanchists. Their main claims are to the results of the Second World War, to the "Yalta system", be it new borders or the division of Europe into "spheres of influence" (both 1956 and 1968 were nothing more than a defense of those spheres).

But an attempt to win back the results of a lost war is revenge. And without any further political coloring, the supporters of such a policy are revanchists. But do you feel how the language itself seems to require supplementing to a stable phrase: "German revanchists"?

The "German revanchists" of the ever-memorable Adolf von Thadden, "impudently demanding a revision of the results of the Second World War." Our superficial agitprop, of course, especially pressed on the name, calling him, von Thadden, "Adolf the Second." And the fact that Adolf von Thadden's sister was one of the heroines of the German Resistance, who was executed in 1944, was not advertised, even if it were accidentally known to the editors of Pravda and Krokodil.

149

And all the decades of repeating this cliché, "German revanchists" prevent the construction of a simple logical chain: "revanchists" in modern Europe are not only Germans. Because not only the Germans were defeated.

Those who did a real and huge and very difficult job of embedding in the United (by [Hitler] Europe) will always be in a complaint against the main culprit in the ruin of their ZAO. Their "affiliation" with fascism is manifested not only in their work at that time, but also in today's anti-Russian policy.

But there is another lady who lost in that war, this is the very idea of political correctness.

The Chamberlains were undoubtedly and irreproachably politically correct: both the Nobel Peace Prize winner Austin and the second, Neville, who brought impeccably executed and correctly signed treaties by everyone (except the then "rogue state" of the USSR), containing, as they announced, "peace for our generation."

And most importantly, the fact that the victory of 1945 was obtained by anti-politically correct means - all this, with objective inevitability, puts this venerable lady (political correctness) in a row

revanchists.

Isn't the author exaggerating when describing the threat of a whole "front of revenge-seekers" and placing completely heterogeneous, incommensurable political forces into it? PACE, the Lithuanian Seim, "Kaistelite" and some kind of "Idea" of some kind of political correctness - why frighten with it?

One talented political scientist noted the following feature of modern Western society (not a flaw, but a feature).

Today the masses want to be a constant object of sounding. And the elites have no idea how to carry out their managerial functions without these "probes".

And what seems important to me to add: these "probes

zhi" are not only and not so much formal elections, referendums. Just the popularity of such events is declining — see the statistics of voter turnout. Modern "zones

sales" is a constant stuffing, testing ideas in the game,

150

semi-game form. Political, historical ideas "out of the box" with films, hits, fashion shows of leading couturiers collections - this is still perceived ...

Closer to "our" topic, the most important social and historical facts of the war were the films "Saving Private Ryan", "Schindler's List", etc. Accordingly, among all the variations of the idea under discussion, the one with the brightest and most popular "video sequence" is selected, that which is better on TV. That is, a replica of the hero of the film. Or even a "historical assessment" from the lips of the actor who played this character. Or even someone else from the crew. Thus, Steven Spielberg, of course, became the main authority on the Holocaust.

So my advice to Rezun to fill up the Trotsky-1939 quotation baggage with the testimonies of Frida Kahlo/ Salma Hayek is not so absurd.

Political correctness, equalizing everyone with everyone in the entire history of the world, is today one of the most "strongly thrown" ideas. US Senators have apologized for the slave trade, the Pope has apologized for the Crusades. The Germans are for the Holocaust. Then the dish is started up in a circle. Turks need to apologize for 1915.

And what do we care about this worldwide fashion for "historical pardons"?

For those fellow citizens who have read the book up to this page and who "don't care about war, history" (although it's hard to combine: indifference to history and reading this book up to this page), but nevertheless I have an argument in store for them. Indeed, the above is such a colorful historical selection that it is not clear: where (and why?) Can it be extrapolated?

Well, according to this logic, the Pope of Rome, after apologizing for the Crusades, simply had to apologize for winning the Battle of Poitiers. (Three hundred years before the Crusades, there were... mmm... let's call it "crescent campaigns": the Arabs conquered then Christian North Africa, Spain, passed half of France, but were defeated at Poitiers.) it's dad, maybe he just didn't have time to apologize?

One can also imagine (Chesterton or Beckett would have appreciated such a theater of the absurd): the current president of a tiny

151

Macedonia at the UN Assembly from the rostrum apologizes to half the world for the campaigns of Alexander the Great ...

Tunisia - in front of Italy for the campaign of Hannibal and the "genocide of the Romans at Cannae." (There is also a direct advertising benefit: after all, "Carthage" today is a tourist brand.) By the way, no one has yet remembered that the crusader was King Saint Louis, practically the main one in the Catholic calendar. And he was canonized precisely for the Crusades, in which he spent his whole life and for which the pope apologized. It turns out that the next pope should apologize for [St. George the Victorious, before... well, maybe before the dragons, lizards of Komodo Island (suggest closer "successors" of the lizard struck by the saint [St. George]. Further, for the Apostle Peter (whose earthly delegate, formally speaking, he, the Pope, is). After all, Peter, too, seizing the sword, cut off that very ear ...

And, in general, this whole list of repentances is so cunningly compiled that it seems to be easy and even fashionable, "cool" to enter into it.

And behind all this carnival of historical pardons, a tense look in our direction: come on! You have to pardon for 1940, and for 1956, and for 1968! Sounds like a wedding tradition in bad taste. A dish in a circle - offerings to the young. And some merchant, after three minutes waving a pack of colored banknotes over his head, finally throws it away ... and immediately looks at you: well, how much will you throw?!

Here, before climbing for your pack, you need to take a closer look (although this will be extremely impolite): what, in fact, did the one who shook for a long time throw? "Color pack"? Maybe there were some "Kerenki"?

So, without having figured it out to the end, they threw "sorry" for Katyn. And thus, as it were, they covered up the issue of 22,000 captured Red Army soldiers who perished in Poland in the 1920s.

And suddenly here... and in Russia a politician will turn up who will apologize, and even from the TV screen, and especially on New Year's Eve - well, how to send two bytes...

Our apologies for Katyn are precisely from the category of such "historical jokes": everyone is gallantly apologizing—come on, too. But only here in this list, where real crimes are mixed up, and God knows what else, it is necessary to turn

152

attention to dates. The Germans apply huge reparations to the Bundeschancellor's apology for the Second World War - but this is a proven and recent crime. The year 1915 also threatens the Turks with the most serious sanctions.

So, those fellow citizens who don't care about "history": with these apologies you can get very real money, they are called "reparations".

So, having heard about the "sorry" for the Crusades, — compatriot! — don't be in a hurry to throw your "pardon" over Katyn. The one who let the tray down is just counting on speed, turmoil, publicity and inconvenience to double-check what your predecessor threw on the merchant's dish.

Namely, "Katyn", as the historian Mukhin writes, requires a thorough study. Including respect for the memory of the Poles who died there requires clarification of the true circumstances of the tragedy, and not chatter and momentary political needs of the future ... the advertising face of Italian pizza.

Slow thoroughness, non-politicization should become the main quality of the "investigators" of those historical cases. But, of course, for the majority, for normal citizens

apologies are unacceptable not because of some kind of “reparation dough”, but because of the presence of national, historical dignity.

It is impossible to consider the current Lithuanian financial account for 1940 - not because it may be overstated (and even probably will be overestimated: you need to know the "Memel heroes"). It cannot be considered even because it means falling on a par with real war criminals — with the Lithuanians themselves, who played along with Hitler in March 1939 — and therefore this is a direct insult to all our compatriots who won victory in that war...

And as for that "Great War", the first of the "years of repentance" should certainly be 1938. Munich, which saved Hitler from collapse, strengthened his power and the potential of Germany.

Further: “United Europe-2” (Brussels) must recognize another simple historical fact – its continuity with United Europe-1! (Berlin), with the exception, of course, of Great Britain and Russia. And all the talk that the Association-2 is based on values, so

153

different from the Unification- |... Like the fact that “countries, nations and specific, still physically living people, we, excuse me, are the same, but the ideals of Berlin and Brussels Europe are different - it's just heaven and earth- la!” All this talk is just a smoke screen.

How does any real trial begin? And, accordingly, a serious historical dispute? Identification of the parties. Who blames? Who testifies? Who offers? And all repentant-historical discussions should begin only with the following questions: did the united European ideas of the Berlin version improve so much, humanize and grow up to the Brussels version? Or were they redeemed by blood in the literal biblical sense? If yes, then whose?

Chapter 13

(Case of Norway)

Whoever agrees with everyone, no one agrees with that.

W. Churchill

Hitler's invasion of Norway, Churchill, who was then the first Lord of the Admiralty, commented in the House of Commons as follows:

“From my point of view, which is shared by my experienced advisers, Herr Hitler made a huge strategic mistake ... and we greatly benefited from what happened in Scandinavia ... He brought into battle a number of formations on the Norwegian coast, for which he will now have to fight, if need be, throughout the summer against powers that have far superior navies and are able to transport these forces to the field of operation with greater ease than he. I don't see any counter-advantage that he has gained... I believe we have benefited greatly from... this gross strategic mistake that our mortal enemy has been provoked into (...).”

154

On the one hand, everyone is well aware that the British could not take advantage of this “Hitler's huge strategic mistake” (and a historian with a bias towards positivist philosophy will add here: “So there was no mistake at all”), they acted extremely slowly, indecisively, mediocre, with the result that the tactical success of the Germans grew into a major strategic achievement. They settled in Norway.

But on the other hand, Churchill was not so far from the truth when he called Norway a trap for Hitler and spoke of the German invasion as a step to which Hitler "was provoked."

One of the amazing post-war discoveries was precisely that, as it turned out, the total aggressor Hitler would have preferred to leave Norway neutral and did not plan to invade it. And only clear signs of impending actions of the allies provoked him to

this step.

After historians have gained access to the captured German documents, one can try to present here something like a parallel "schedule" of the development of Hitler's and the British's plans for Norway.

September 19, 1939: At the urging of Churchill, the British Cabinet accepted the project of creating a minefield in Norwegian territorial waters and "blocking the transport of Swedish iron ore from Narvik" to Germany. (Similar projects were raised during the First World War.) The issue of setting minefields off the coast of Norway became a topic of discussion even in the press. And this caused concern and countermeasures on the part of the Germans.

Early October 1939: the first mention of Norway at all - the commander-in-chief of the naval forces, Admiral Raeder, expressed fear that the Norwegians might open their ports to the British, and reported to Hitler about the possible strategic consequences if the British took these ports. Raeder noted that it would be beneficial for German submarine operations to have bases on the coast of Norway, for example in Trondheim. However, Hitler rejected this proposal. His thoughts were occupied with plans for an offensive in the West, and he did not want to hear about any operations that could divert forces and resources from the Western Front.

155

November 1939: Soviet-Finnish war. Churchill saw this as a new opportunity to strike at the enemy's flank under the pretext of helping Finland: "I welcomed this development and saw in it the possibility of achieving the main strategic advantage - depriving [Germany of access to vital iron ore reserves."

December 16, 1939: Churchill's plan to send an expeditionary force to Finland. "Such actions will possibly force the Germans to occupy Scandinavia, since "if you shoot at the enemy, he will shoot back" ... we gain more than we lose from the German strike against Norway and Sweden."

November 1939: In Berlin, the former Minister of Defense Quisling, leader of the National Rally (No. Mazuopa! Zat[ipe], met with Admiral Raeder and instilled in him the fear that England would soon occupy Norway. Quisling asked for money and help to carry out a coup to overthrow the Norwegian government. He assured that he would be supported by several senior Norwegian officers, among them the head of the garrison in Narvik, Colonel Sundlo. Quisling promised to give Narvik to the Germans, who would thus outstrip the British.

Raeder persuaded Hitler to speak with Quisling in person. The meetings took place on 16 and 18 November. According to the recording of these conversations, Hitler said that he "would prefer to see Norway, like the other Scandinavian countries, neutral, because ... does not want to expand the theater of war ... but if the enemy is preparing to expand the frontiers of the war, he will take steps to to protect yourself from this danger.

AMATEUR INQUIRIES And why, in fact? Was Quisling a "quisling"?

The question is perhaps the most "amateurish" in this section. But the collective agitprop image of the "quislinger" (traitor, executioner, sadist, Hitler's henchman, imitator and "little Himmler" for his country)...

156

Vidkund Quisling (/u1\$Ip0) doesn't really fit. The son of a priest. In 1918 he was a military attaché at the Norwegian embassy in Petrograd, in 1920-1921 he was an attaché in Helsinki. In 1922-1923, he was a member of the international commission to assist the starving in the Volga region, the closest collaborator of F. Nansen. That is, as I understand it, he gave up his military and diplomatic career for the sake of charitable work next to one of the most prominent humanists of the 20th century. In general, not the brightest representative of the "quislings". BUT... he returned to Norway as a staunch anti-communist. (Looked at.)

In 1930, he published the book *Russia and Us*, directed against the communist regime. In 1931-1933 he was Minister of War, he welcomed the coming of the NSDAP to power in Germany. In May 1933 he founded the Fascist Party (NS). In the elections of 1933, the National Assembly received 27,850 votes, and in the elections of 1936 - 26,577 (a small result). And then ... After the entry of the German troops on April 9, 1940 - "Hitler's assistant." In various roles: first, a self-proclaimed prime minister. After the dissolution of the government by the German authorities - Commissioner of the Administrative Council of Norway for the demobilization of the army. On February 2, 1942, he was again appointed Prime Minister by the occupying authorities ... On May 9, 1945, he surrendered to the police. Sentenced... Shot. Of all the representatives of Hitler in the "United Europe", for some reason, it was his name that became a household name: "Quislingian" = see above.

January 13, 1940. An entry in the war diary of the headquarters of the German navy: "The most favorable solution would be to maintain the neutrality of Norway." At the same time, there is already concern in the headquarters that "England intends to occupy Norway with the tacit consent of the Norwegian government."

On January 27, Hitler ordered his military advisers to draw up, if necessary, a detailed plan for the invasion of Norway. The headquarters specially formed for this purpose held its first meeting on 5 February.

February 16: Fatal incident. The German ship *Altmark*, pursued by English destroyers, on which English prisoners were transported from the South Atlantic,

157

elk in norwegian fjord. Churchill ordered the commander of the destroyer "Kossak" captain | the rank of Wayanu to enter Norwegian waters and rescue the British prisoners who were on board the *Altmark*. The English destroyer was driven off by two Norwegian gunboats, and the subsequent protest of the Norwegian government against the invasion of Norwegian waters was rejected.

But Hitler regarded this protest as a gesture intended to deceive him, and was inclined to believe that the Norwegian government was collaborating with England. According to the German admirals, the incident with the *Altmark* played a decisive role in Hitler's agreement to start an intervention in Norway.

Here it is, the real tragedy of the "neutral"! Norway was desperately balancing between the threats of English and German invasion. And their very light rebuff to the British brought the German threat closer.

February 20, 1940: Hitler instructed General von Falkenhorst to prepare an expeditionary force for a landing in Norway, saying: "I have been informed of the intention of the British to land in this area, and I want to be there before them. The occupation of Norway by the British would be a strategic success, as a result of which the British would gain access to the Baltic, where we have neither troops nor coastal fortifications.

On March 4, Hitler issued a directive to complete preparations for the invasion. In addition to Norway, it was also planned to occupy Denmark, which was considered as a necessary strategic springboard and stronghold for ensuring German communications. But still final

Hitler has not yet decided to invade. As the transcripts of the meetings between Hitler and Raeder show, the Fuhrer, on the one hand, continued to believe that "keeping Norway neutral is the best option" for Germany, and on the other hand, he was afraid of the British landing in Norway.

9 March: Assessing the plans of action for the naval forces, Hitler spoke of the dangers of the forthcoming operation, contrary to all principles of warfare at sea, and at the same time asserted that it was "urgently needed".

13 March: German concern increased. There was a report that British submarines were concentrating off the southern coast of Norway.

158

March 14: A radio message was intercepted instructing Allied transports to be in
ready to sail.

March 15: Several French officers arrive in Bergen. The Germans felt they were being overtaken, as their own expeditionary force was not yet ready.

20 March: This was the date of the scheduled English landing at Narvik. The landing force was supposed to quickly move across the territory of Norway to the iron ore deposits in Gyllivar. However, the military defeat of Finland and its capitulation on March 13 upset these plans. The Allies lost the pretext for entering Norway.

April 8: This was the newly appointed date for the British operation in Norway. But this new delay fatally reduced the chances of the Allies to succeed in the operation, as it made it possible for the Germans to invade Norway ahead of the Allies.

| April Hitler was informed that the Norwegian anti-aircraft and coastal batteries had been given permission to open fire without waiting for an order from the high command. This meant that the Norwegians were preparing for action, and if Hitler had delayed, he would have lost the chances of achieving surprise and success. The final date for the invasion... April 9th.

On April 9, English newspapers reported that the day before ships of the naval forces of England and France entered Norwegian waters and set minefields there to block the way to these waters for the ships of countries trading with Germany. Enthusiastic responses to these measures alternated in the press with arguments justifying the violation of Norway's neutrality. However, the newspapers were lagging behind the events, because that same morning the radio broadcast a much more startling report: German troops were landing at several points on the coast of Norway and had already entered Denmark.

Next, we quote the English historian Liddell Hart ([144e! Natz), whose work "The Second World War" became ... I repeat the assessment of experts, "almost the main official history of the British armed forces":

"The audacity of Germany, which did not take into account the superiority of England at sea, shocked the allied leaders. Speaking in the House of Commons that day, Prime Minister Chamberlain announced that the Germans had landed on the west coast of the Nore.

159

vegia near Bergen and Trondheim, as well as on the south coast. Chamberlain went on to say: "Several reports have been received of a similar landing at Narvik, but I highly doubt their plausibility." It seemed unbelievable to the British leaders that Hitler would dare to land so far north, especially since their own naval forces were in full force in this area, covering the laying of mines and other activities. It has been suggested that Narvik was confused with Larvik, a place on the southern coast of Norway. However, by the end of the day it became known that the Germans occupied the capital

Norway Oslo and major ports including Narvik. All landing operations were carried out simultaneously and were crowned with success.

... An interesting discovery will be how small forces were captured by the capital and major ports of Norway. They included 2 battlecruisers, a "pocket" battleship, 7 cruisers, 14 destroyers, 28 submarines, a number of auxiliary vessels, and about 10,000 personnel from the forward units of the three divisions used for the invasion. In no place did the number of the first echelon of the landing force exceed 2,000 people. One airborne battalion took part in the capture of the airfields in Oslo and Stavanger. This was the first time parachute troops were used in the war, and they proved to be a very effective means. However, the decisive role in the success of the Germans was played by the air force (800 combat and 250 transport aircraft)...

"Aviation literally stunned the Norwegian population, and then paralyzed countermeasures allies."

On April 7, at 13.25, British aviation discovered a large force of the German fleet moving rapidly northward through the Skagerrak to the coast of Norway. Churchill writes: "... it was hard for us to believe that these forces were heading to Narvik, despite the message from Copenhagen about Hitler's intention to seize this port."

Moreover, as Churchill notes, the Norwegian government at that time was "preoccupied mainly with the actions of the British." The mine-laying operations of the British diverted the attention of the Norwegians precisely in those crucial 24 hours when the Germans landed.

160

The greatest surprise of all the successes of the Germans in the early days was the capture of Narvik, for this northern port was at a distance of about 1200 miles from the German naval bases. Two Norwegian coastal defense ships were bravely met by German destroyers, but were quickly sunk. The coastal defense forces did not even attempt to resist... The next day, a flotilla of English destroyers entered the fjord and entered the battle. Both sides suffered equal losses. On April 13, a new detachment of English destroyers arrived, led by the battleship Warspite. The German ships were done away with, but by this time the German troops were already entrenched in and around Narvik.

At Bergen, the Germans suffered some losses from Norwegian warships and batteries, but, having landed on the shore, they did not meet any resistance.

However, on the approaches to Oslo, the main invading forces received a tangible blow: the cruiser Blucher, on board of which there were many military personnel, was sunk by torpedoes from the Oscarsborg fortress, and the Germans had to abandon their attempt to enter the bay until the fortress surrendered after powerful air raids. Also, the Norwegians can write down the cruisers "Karlsruhe" and "Königsberg" on the combat account - they, wrecked, lost their mobility, have already been finished off by British submarines and aviation ...

Thus, the task of capturing the Norwegian capital was entrusted to the parachute troops (and was completed) ... by five companies of paratroopers landed at the capital's airfield Forneby. Leaving the planes, the paratroopers lined up in a column and moved to Oslo with the orchestra in front ... At noon, this airborne assault parade entered the city. However, the delay caused by preparations for this parade allowed the king and government to flee north.

The batteries of the Kristiansand fortress drove the German ships away from the coast, and then bombers were thrown at the fortress, silencing the batteries (...).

Here I will interrupt Garth Liddell. And in his further descriptions, and in Caius Becker's "Military Diaries of the Luftwaffe" I was most struck by this ... how to call it, "view

uneven resistance. And I think you will agree with me.

161

From Becker:

"..three of the six Me-110s flew on the same engine. And everyone had the last drops of fuel. We must immediately sit down! And if no one is capable of capturing Oslo-Forneby, then the fighter crews will do it themselves! .. even Lent appeared on foot, leaving his Messer Schmitt with a cut-off landing gear near a house on the border of the airfield. He and his radio operator Kubis miraculously escaped injury, the latter even removed a machine gun with a disk and came to the aid of his squadron mates - a handful of people who had captured a guarded airfield!

At 9.17 a flight of Junkers began to land. The braking distance of heavy vehicles led them to the very rocks where air defense posts were equipped... The soldiers got out of the planes and began to warm up after a tiring flight in a constrained state. After making sure that everything around is calm, they lit a cigarette. Hansen's hair stood on end. Rushing to the soldiers, he showed where the Norwegian anti-aircraft guns and machine-gun nests were. Here they finally took cover and sent forward reconnaissance groups, which soon returned with prisoners. The Norwegians pleaded defeated... the prisoners were ordered to clear the runway from the smoking wreckage of aircraft... the messenger proudly handed over the telegram: "Forneby is in our hands. | squadron (ÿ76>... At the corps headquarters in Hamburg, these 8 Messerschmitts were already considered decommissioned (...}».

The "unevenness of resistance" across branches of the military is amazing, you must agree. Norwegian sailors (and coastal forces) sink German cruisers, and the air base surrenders to fighter crews. (These are two people who need to land, get out of the plane.)

And then the whole capital "accepts the parade" of five landing companies. It's like... I don't know if the Norwegians will be offended, more like the expeditions of the conquistador Cortes. The natives also fought tolerably with cold weapons, but the thunder of muskets and the sight of a cavalryman inspired mystical horror in them, and they surrendered, even having a numerical superiority of 10:1, 20:1.

The unevenness of reaching the state-political impulse to different branches of the military, or these impulses themselves, orders-instructions are deliberately different ... Again, remember

162

There are Soviet and American cosmonauts (military) shaking hands at the same time when their fellow submariners were ramming each other. (In the chapter on Hugo Grotius and the Law of War and Peace.) |

Newspaper commentators noted, albeit with great restraint, the difference in the behavior of the brother kings: Christian X, the Danish king who capitulated to the Germans (he even congratulated the German general Chimer on a "brilliant job"), and the Norwegian king Haakon UP . Refusing to capitulate, he fled with the government to the city of Elverum, on the Swedish border, and called on the people to resist the invaders...

And now about the "main occupier", about the German commander in Norway.

ONE GENERAL, ONE COUNTRY

Not being a collector of biographies of various characters of the Third Reich, however, for a very long time, and rather by accident, I remembered that some German general drew up a plan to capture Norway using a tourist map. That information flashed in an era when serious literature with information, especially biographical information, about the "other side" was not published in our country. Early 70s. The memoirs of Marshal Zhukov have just been published, and at the cost of the great commander Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev getting on their pages. And from the persons, the names of the Third Reich were known

only the inmates of the Nuremberg dock + those who escaped from the retribution of the peoples according to the method of their demon-possessed Fuhrer + some more covered up by the Americans for the needs of the future "revenge" ... and that's it, then the gray mass.

And now, in our days, I read: yes, indeed, General Falkenhorst developed a plan for an operation to seize Denmark and Norway on a tourist map: this fact seemed significant even to the compiler of the strict Encyclopedia of the Third Reich.

The Norwegian operation is indeed one of the most daring and successful in the entire Second World War. It is also unique how small forces were carried out the seizure of the country, and then,

163

that the amphibious assault was carried out despite the overwhelming advantage of the allied fleet. But what did that "tourist card" mean?

Despite the fact that in the German (as, indeed, in any other) [General Staff there is a "complete dossier" on any country (especially one that was a likely theater of military operations back in the First World War!), including not only the most detailed maps, but also thousands of pages of other necessary information about roads, bridges, fairways, mooring walls, etc. That is, for some not very clear sign, the choice of the Fuhrer in February 1940 fell on General Falkenhorst - as an alternative to the entire German Tenshtab. In general, it is known that Hitler carried out such combinations several more times. (Manstein was able to present to the Führer his revolutionary new idea of defeating France only with the patronage of Rundstedt, and bypassing the entire General Staff, and having received ardent approval to begin detailed development.) But since Falkenhorst's "impromptu" is one of the most scanty biographical and official data to find some prerequisites ...

More or less unique in the life of "our hero" BEFORE 1940, it may seem that he changed his surname for some reason. Among the top generals of Germany, this is either a rarity, or even the only case. The real one at Nikolaus von Falkenhorst was (honestly!) ... von Jass-trzembski. True, the biographical site writes it as "Jastszembski", but the "Encyclopedia" is a priority here. How to interpret this unique "questionnaire maneuver" of the German general? Of course, there could be no talk of any inconvenience of wearing surnames with a Slavic ending, let alone discrimination. Among the Prussian-German aristocracy and the army (and this is almost the same thing), more than a third of the surnames were OR "Ich", OR "Ski" ... But, one way or another, the replacement with the preservation of the noble "von" and the "predatory" orientation (Falkenhorst - "falcon's nest") occurred.

So, Nikolaus von.... Yastrzhembsky was born in 1886 in Breslau (Breslav), Silesia.

During the First World War, he was an officer of the General Staff, later he supervised operations in the Baltic states of the well-known General von der Goltz, and then he himself joined his Volunteer Corps. In the thirties - military attache

164

in Prague, Belgrade, Bucharest. That is, both by birth and at the place of service, he was associated with Eastern Europe. However, the same "Encyclopedia" notes: in the Polish campaign of 1939 he took "insignificant part".

In 1940 he was called to Berlin, and then this one of the most successful impromptu in military history took place. For some reason (a brief stay in Finland in 1918?) [Hitler suddenly suggests that he — one of his many hundreds of generals — sketch out a plan for the Norwegian operation. In complete secrecy from Commander-in-Chief Brauchitsch and Chief of the General Staff Halder. It was then that the historic purchase of the tourist card followed. The report probably made an impression, and on February 21 von Falkenhorst was appointed

the head of the development of the Weserübung plan to capture Norway. | March von Falkenhorst was appointed commander of a separate army XXJ group with subordination only personally to Hitler.

April 9 - the beginning of the operation. On the 10th, almost all goals were achieved. Further, as is known, the landing of the British and their growing resistance caused Hitler to panic ... but von Falkenhorst continued the operation and by May 3rd forced the Allies to flee Namos.

On April 30, von Falkenhorst received the title of Knight of the Iron Cross.

The British still held out near Narvik, but by June 8, von Falkenhorst forced them to leave Norway completely.

Von Falkenhorst was a supporter of the humane treatment of prisoners and civilians. Hitler, in the moment of panic mentioned, ordered Falkenhorst to take 20 hostages, including the Bishop of Bergen, if the Norwegians continued to resist. Falkenhorst did not follow this order.

And all his further service is one long conflict with the sent imperial governor of Norway - the cruel executioner Josef Treboven, the former Gauleiter of Essen. Falkenhorst earned the respect of the Norwegians and his modesty. Reichskommissar Treboven lived in the royal palace, von Falkenhorst lived in two rooms in the building of the Norwegian Automobile Club.

July 25 - Von Falkenhorst is appointed commander of the Wehrmacht in Norway.

165

In 1941, his troops were ordered to advance on Murmansk - the Silver Fox plan. But the Soviet troops are fighting very hard, von Falkenhorst suffers heavy losses. There, each hill cost him more than all of Norway. He lays down 5,500 soldiers for advancing 10 kilometers and is ultimately defeated and stopped.

In 1943, he was entrusted with the development of a plan for the invasion of Sweden. |

His further actions included the fight against English sabotage groups. In November 1942, according to the then existing rules, he handed over the captured English commandos to the SD (security service). The prisoners were shot.

Von Falkenhorst protested to Keitel and henceforth forbade all his troops to hand over prisoners to the SD. The protests and intrigues of the governor Treboven led to the fact that von Falkenhorst lost his command. His group in 1944 was placed under the command of General Rendulich. And in Berlin, General Falkenhorst is perceived not only as a soft-bodied liberal, but also as a loser. However, both this loss of reputation and the sending of Treboven are associated with the intrigues of Hermann Goering, an old enemy of Falkenhorst. So the general remained the conqueror of one country...

On January 20, 1945 he was awarded the Silver German Cross.

He was arrested on August 2, 1946 and sentenced to death by a British tribunal (for those executed commandos. There were versions that: the resentment of the British also played a role - as the creator of one of their most offensive defeats). But on December 3, the death penalty was commuted to 20 years in prison. On June 23, 1953, von Falkenhorst was released. Died at 83 life.

Chapter 14 ON THE MEASUREMENT OF RESISTANCE The electrical resistance of us, as we know, taught

to measure the German Georg Ohm, the author of the law of the same name. But how and with what to measure the resistance to the Germans in World War II

166

war? If, in comparison with the state potential in the service of [Hitler], the value of, say, the Czech Resistance movement is incomparable, then with what can this value be compared, correctly compared?

Of course, with the significance, the scope of resistance movements in other countries! For example, with the successes of the Resistance in France, Belarus or ... Germany.

Yes Yes. If the resistance movements in each country that was part of the Nazi CJS "Europe" are considered today not just as a politically correct "Information about the presence of Resistance", issued to cover up the fact that the entire state was working for the fascist bloc, but according to real combat successes and sacrifices, it must be admitted that among the Resistance, the main one was still German: the Red Chapel, oriented towards Moscow, and the Black Chapel - diplomats, senior officials, field marshals, generals.

In 1938, they, led by Beck and Brauchitsch, prepared the overthrow of Hitler. Field Marshals Beck, Kleist, adviser to Bosch AG concern Gerdler, meeting with senior British officials and diplomats, guaranteed that they would put an end to the dictatorship if Great Britain went to military intervention on the Czech question.

The Berlin police chief and Field Marshal Witzleben, commander of the 3rd Berlin Military District, rehearsed the capture of the Reich Chancellery. Even the SS took a wait-and-see attitude. All diplomats and correspondents noticed a strange stupor in Berlin. "People in the city stop using the Germanic greeting, throw out their hand and return to the old forms," notes Rudolf Hess. For two months, "the coin stood on its edge," and, as the conspirators of 1944 admitted before their execution, only the "Munich Summit," the main foreign and domestic political trump card, saved Hitler. In the next attempt of the "Black Chapel", undertaken in June 1944, it came to street fighting in Berlin. But these are only two direct attempts to overthrow Hitler, and the German Resistance in other forms continued throughout the war.

By the way, Stauffenberg, chief of staff of the Reserve Army, who flew to report to the Fuhrer with a portfolio of explosives, illustrates not only the thesis of this chapter: worthy Germans, like the French, Czechs, resisted the Fuhrer. Second, already

167

a completely unexpected illustration: Klaus Schenk von Staufenberg, veteran, crippled leg, without his right hand, without two fingers on his left, without an eye, on July 20, 1944, reports to the Fuhrer about plans for resistance in the West. The fact that the number of Germans fighting in France at that moment was incommensurable with the number of those fighting in Russia is also recognized by Western historians. But as a symbol of a qualitative relationship, one hand, three left fingers of the chief of staff, in my opinion, are quite suitable. In the West, it is, in fact, a disabled team.

I will now venture to offer such, I admit, an indirect method for assessing the strength of the Resistance: by "the failure of the top German leadership."

Field Marshal General - the highest rank after the Reichsmarshal in the Wehrmacht. In the entire history of the Third Reich, there was only one Reichsmarshal (Goering), field marshals as Baku commissars - 26, including 19 in the ground forces. can say a lot.

Four were in service until the end of the war:

Von Bush,

Von Weichs an dem Glon,

Keitel,

Scherner (the last commander of Army Group Center, did not have time to take the post of commander-in-chief, 05/07/1945 was surrounded near Prague).

Eight were dismissed (the lines in brackets are for what, by whose efforts):

von Brauchitsch - resigned on December 6, 1941 (the day after the attack near Moscow) and was dismissed on December 19, 1941;

von Bock - dismissed 07/15/1942 (at the time of the battle near Voronezh);

von Blomberg - fired on 01/25/1938 (sexual scandal, wife turned out to be a prostitute and pornographic actress);

von K  chler - dismissed 01/31/1944 (commander of Army Group North, defeat near Leningrad);

Manstein - dismissed 03/30/1944 (after the battles near Cherkassy); von Leeb - dismissed 01/16/1942 (corps from his

Army Group "North" was surrounded near Demyansk); List - dismissed 09/09/1942 (at the time of the attack on the North Caucasus);

168

von Runstedt - dismissed 03/09/1945 (at the time of the fighting on the Rhine).

That is, dismissed due to defeats on the Eastern Front - 6, on the Western - 1.

Intrigue, sexual scandal - 1.

Killed, captured - three:

von Reichenau - 01/12/1942 (commander of Army Group Center, heart attack in Poltava, delivered to Germany dead);

Model - committed suicide on 04/21/1945 (troops surrounded by allies);

Paulus - taken prisoner 01/31/1943 in Stalingrad.

Knocked out by the German Resistance - four:

von Kleist - arrested 07/20/1944. for "failure to report a conspiracy";

von Witzleben - executed 08/08/1944;

von Kluge - committed suicide on August 18, 1944;

Rommel - committed suicide on 10/14/1944.

As you can see, the German Resistance disabled four field marshals, which is more than their losses on the battlefield (three)!

And one should add to the results of the Resistance: Admiral Canaris, chief of the Abwehr, was executed in 1945; Chief of Staff of the 1930s, Colonel-General von Hammerstein-Eckvord, commander of the 4th Panzer Group Hoepner, Hitler's military adviser Wilhelm Scheidt (repeatedly handed over secret plans to the allies), Eduard Wagner - quartermaster, head of department

supplies of the General Staff, Ambassador in Rome Hassel, head of the French military administration Stulpnagel...

The only great success of the Czech Resistance, but also the one that caused the most grandiose funeral in the entire history of the Reich, was the assassination of the Reich Protector of Bohemia and Moravia, the chief of the SD, Reinhard Heydrich. Seven Czech paratroopers landed from a British Halifax aircraft (the namesake of one of the main "Munich") and on May 27, 1942, fired on Heydrich's car, which was heading to the airport to fly to Berlin. The Reichsprotector rode alone with the driver

169

Lem in his dark green, open Mercedes known throughout the Czech Republic. (Which expressively expresses calmness in his Czech protectorate.) Actually, the shooters did not hit, but Heydrich ordered to stop the car, he wanted to personally shoot the saboteurs. One of them threw a grenade. The mortally wounded Heydrich writhed in the street for a long time, passers-by, passengers of the tram looked at him with horror. When Heydrich was nevertheless taken to the hospital, the agony continued for another 8 hours. What may have added to the Fuhrer's fury was the strange and controversial statement by the doctors that the fragments of the grenade were also poisoned. Heydrich was riddled with these fragments, the spleen had to be removed. Some doctors explain some chemical changes in the blood by this amputation, and not by "unknown bacteria". In Berlin, as the diplomat Gisevius recalls, the most "grand and terrible Babylonian funeral ceremony" took place. The entire Czech Republic was forced to observe mourning, and the mining settlement of Lidice (in our country, for some reason, more often called a village) was completely destroyed in retaliation, all men over 15 were shot, women and children were sent to concentration camps...

But the real Czech Resistance, the revival of the national spirit, was the first moment when an armed Czech, in national military uniform, openly stood up against an armed German. These were the actions of the First Czechoslovak Corps, formed in the USSR and taking its place in the ranks in the battles on the Dukla Pass.

Indeed, let's just here, on the "Czech pages", think about all three categories, three variants of those who resisted in that war: soldiers, partisans, underground fighters.

In fact, these are three philosophical categories, and the fact that the last two usually go together, that a stable verbal cliché has developed: "underground partisans in occupied countries..." — this simplification obscures one fundamental difference. Partisans, albeit in the most remote forests, mountains, are still a more open, "semi-state" challenge, a different psychology than that of an underground worker.

The underground worker is, of course, the highest rise of personal heroism - but it is personal. There were underground workers in all European countries, partisans - no.

170

To rise from the underground to the level of partisan struggle required a higher degree of dedication of the entire nation (plus, of course, geographical conditions. But the mountainous forest of Luxembourg, for example, was no less favorable for the actions of partisan detachments, than Italy, Yugoslavia).

The underground life environment is a sea of conquered people, the townsfolk. Life form - mimicry under the layman. Therefore, his resistance is not yet the revival of mass

national spirit. He is an avenger, but not yet a protector.

Again, philosophically speaking, what awaits the consciousness of the people of the occupied country? Restoration of the situation: "before the war", "before the defeat". And the situation was as follows: a defender (soldier) - it is known for sure that he exists, but his activity should not be here, but closer to

borders (fighting, preparing, standing guard). Here, in the capital, in peaceful cities, the defender can only be a participant in parades, caring for girls ...

And yet, most importantly: the defender carries weapons openly. And generally speaking, one can defend (shield, stand between the defended and the enemy) only openly. Revenge - whatever.

And the activity of the underground is exactly the opposite. He is nearby, he is in a neighboring house (explosions, murders of traitors). He does not carry weapons openly. From the point of view of the layman, the underground worker is the same layman, only more desperate. And there are also other variants of perception: he is more marginal, more evil, having nothing to lose, ruthless, irresponsible, impudent.

And the partisan, according to this logic, is still almost a defender, almost a soldier. Although in the most remotely inaccessible territory of his country, he nevertheless carries weapons openly.

The purpose of this "philosophical digression" about the difference between a warrior and an underground worker, a defender and an avenger is to emphasize that the first Czech defenders of the Czech Republic, who revived its spirit, its national pride, were the fighters of the USSR formed in the 44th year on the Dukla Pass. First Czechoslovak Corps.

And those who killed Heydrich are, of course, outstanding heroes, but they are the avengers. And one more addition: after all, these were only

171

partly Czech sub-policemen, and partly an English sabotage detachment, paratroopers dropped from an English plane ...

The choice line split Yugoslavia. In the early stages, the leading role in the Resistance was played by the Serbian Chetniks of General Draže Mihailović.

When Stalin demanded on 4 September 1941 that the Western Allies open a front in the Balkans to "draw 30-40 divisions from the Eastern Front", Churchill presented the Chetnik uprising as a replacement for this Balkan front. He told the Soviet leadership that the British allies, the Serbs, at the British request, were already pinning down several dozen divisions of the Axis states. In addition, they organized a partisan army, which, despite difficult relations with the Chetniks (it even came to direct clashes), by the autumn of 1944 numbered up to 650,000 thousand people and attracted three German army groups of 400 thousand people. , which were armed with 2130 guns and mortars, 125 tanks and assault guns, 352 combat aircraft. Plus, Tito's actions fettered 190,000 German allies. And the German allies in Yugoslavia were Croats and Muslims.

On April 10, 1941, the Independent State of Croatia (IH) was proclaimed in Zagreb, which included the Croatian lands of Bosnia and Herzegovina proper. Ante Pavelić became the Poglavnik (leader) of Croatia, and two representatives of Bosnian Muslims entered the government of independent Croatia. 1| April, on the basis of the law on the army and navy, the armed forces of the NGH began to be created.

The Fuhrer's Table Talk of October 13, 1941 records Hitler's impressions of meeting with the Croatian Minister of War Kvaternik: "And when I see him, I see that same racial type, devoted, unwaveringly true to his word. They (Croats) claim that in fact they are the descendants of the Goths, the fact that they speak Slavic is some kind of misunderstanding. And it is not clear why the Fuhrer adds: "If Croatia were part of the Reich, we would entrust them with the protection of the swamps (!)".

According to Churchill, the war between the Serbs and the Croats turned into "a bloody vendetta with mutual executions -

172

mi". But the main atrocities of that time, like the barrels of gouged out eyes, belong to them, the failed German "marsh guards".

"Muslim volunteers. formations" in the Balkans included four Albanian rifle regiments, four fascist militia battalions and a gendarmerie under the command of General Prenk Prevesi. In addition, the armed formations of the Vai Kosh Tsag organization, created at the end of 1942 in southern Albania, and the Kosova Regiment regiment, formed in 1943 in Kosovska Mitrovica, should be included among the Albanian collaborators. The Albanian militia was also subordinate to the German authorities.

In February 1943, Himmler ordered the creation of divisions of the SS troops from Bosnian Muslim volunteers to conduct anti-partisan operations in Yugoslavia. The 3rd SS Mountain Division "Handshar" was formed, which was originally called "Bosnia-Herzegovina". The level of training of volunteers was low, and in September 1943 the division was sent for retraining to France. German officers treated their Muslim wards with contempt. As a result, they rebelled and killed several German officers. The rebellion was crushed, the instigators executed, but the division, the only SS formation that ever rebelled, was not disbanded. In February 1944, the division was sent to Yugoslavia, where it took part in battles with the Partisans in the Brcko region (spring 1944) and where it gained a sinister reputation with its

cruelty.

In January 1944, the recruitment of Bosnian Muslims to the 23rd Kama Mountain Division was announced. In April 1944, Himmler ordered the formation of another division, this time from Kosovo Albanians, the 21st Skanderbeg Mountain Division. By August 1944, the division was fully formed, consisting of 6.5 thousand people. The division was considered fit only for police actions.

The divisions were given many privileges, such as special rations and permission to perform religious rites. This privilege was contrary to the anti-religious ideology of the SS, but Himmler declared [Ebbels that he "had nothing against Islam, because it promises a Muslim

173

we are heaven if they die in battle - religion is very pragmatic and attractive to soldiers!

At the end of 1944, the retreat of German troops from the Balkans began. The Muslim volunteers were deemed useless for fighting on the front lines, and in September 1944, the division's Muslim units were disbanded.

AMATEUR INQUIRIES Why so much detail specifically about Yugoslav affairs?

And it is simply impossible not to notice the amazing similarity, but what is there! — one hundred percent coincidence of sympathies and antipathies of "United (by Hitler) Europe" in 1941-1944 and "United (by Clinton) Europe" in 1992-1999. Ethnic cleansing was (admittedly) carried out by all three parties, but the choice was clear. The Croats and Muslims condemned a dozen field commanders, the Serbs - the entire state. It's as if it's sitting in the genes - some have the determination to rise up, to go against the opinion of all of Europe, as in March 1941. Others... have a complex, viscous-heavy mixture of feelings, but, I would venture to suggest, both a certain irritation and a secret envy of the "decided", "who did not take into account the opinion and choice of all Europe", in short, to the "others". Maybe this irritated memory of the Frenchman that "it was he who regularly fed the German in 1941 (remember that annual duty: 750,000 tons of wheat, 140,000 tons of meat, 650 million liters of milk, 220 million liters of wine), when these reckless Serbs...", and led France to participate in the anti-Yugoslav war [999?

Chapter 15 WHERE WAS THE NOBLE THEN?

(Baltic abacus)

I think it has long been clear to readers that one of the targets of my pamphlet is the so-called "policy of double standards." This topic is now, of course, one of the most popular on the lips of presidents, deputies, diplomats,

174

historians, political scientists. The struggle for justice in assessing the history of the twentieth century. Although there is a certain terminological paradox in relation to the assessments of wars: here the source of all injustice lies precisely in ... the "policy of one standard". It sounds unusual, even wild, but think about it: the same standard is applied and applied to the warring Russia as to the behavior of France, the Czech Republic (former

the standing of the world in 1941 is the same as in 2005). The essence, of course, remains - injustice. To one

(identical) acts are subject to double (different) standards, to other actions, events (fundamentally different), on the contrary, the same one is applied... With great difficulty, recognition of this was wrested from US President George W. Bush in one interview 2005 of the year. On the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II, his big tour of Europe was timed. On May 6-10, the President visited Latvia and Guzia... "participating in ceremonies dedicated to the newly gained independence of Latvia and the success of the peaceful Rose Revolution in Georgia."

The seriousness of the topic touched upon, the level of the person who gave the marks, require an appropriate attitude to this text. Therefore, the interview is given in the version verified by the Bureau of International Information Programs (BIPI) of the US Department of State. Questions mainly belong to the NTV correspondent.

Question. Good morning, Mr. President, although for the Russian audience it is a good evening due to the time difference. Your father is a World War II hero, the youngest Navy pilot. How important is Victory Day for you personally and for your family?

The president. Thanks for asking about my dad. Like many in America and Russia, he was among those called upon to defend the world from Nazism. And, fortunately, he returned home. And today the holiday in Russia will remind us all of the sacrifices made in my case by the person I love, but also by a whole generation of men and women who have made extraordinary efforts to protect their homeland in the case of Russia, to work in the case of America.

175

with the allies to defeat Adolf Hitler as well as the Japanese. For me personally, this is a special day because it reminds me of a young guy's readiness to fight. But it also reminds me of my generation's duty to work together to make the world a better place.

Question. The contours of post-war Europe changed in accordance with the outcome of the Yalta Conference in 1943, a decision taken by three very important personalities of the time - Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin. How fair is it to hold Russia alone responsible for all the misfortunes of Eastern Europe and the Baltic states?

The president. A very fair question. This decision was made at the end of the war. I think the main complaint is that the form of power under which the Baltic countries had to live was not chosen by them. But there is no doubt that the decision was made by three leaders.

Question. So, not only Russia is a negative character in history?

The president. I think everyone should bear when historians look back at Yalta, should be aware that not only – you point it out correctly – not only the Russian leader, but also the British and American leaders sat at the table and agreed.

Question. In Russia, we are very concerned about the growth of neo-Nazism in the Baltic states, when Russian war veterans are publicly humiliated, when monuments to Russian soldiers are desecrated, and at the same time, on May 8, it is planned to open a monument to the Nazi brigade, which is well known not only for military operations against Russians, but also rather vile things that were common for SS troops.

The president. Yes. When I go to the Baltic countries, I will have this message: it is important to respect democracy, but to respect democracy means to respect the rights of minorities. In other words, true democracy proclaims that minorities are important and that the will of the majority cannot suppress the minority. As for whether the country is revered

176

We are Nazism, of course, this should be rejected. Nazism was crushed. We celebrate the defeat of Nazism. We do not want Nazism to return. The extremist point of view is that it is possible to violate the rights of minorities. The Nazis exterminated millions of Jews, for example, and this is a classic example of how the rights of minorities were violated. And we must never forget the lessons of why we fought together during World War II. Therefore, I look forward to launching this call for tolerance.

Question. A question that has nothing to do with your visit to Russia, but is very important for us as an oil-producing country. You once mentioned that you would be happy to find a magic wand and lower the price of oil. What price of oil would be acceptable to the United States, and what do you think is the chance of finding this magic wand?

The president. No, there is no magic wand. The soldier asked me: why don't you lower the price of gasoline? It's like the government controls prices. In my country, the government does not control prices. And I told him: if I had a magic wand, I would wave it and lower your prices, but this is not done. The price is based on supply and demand. And demand in relation to supply is growing, and this is beneficial for oil-producing countries like Russia. And I don't know what the right price is. Of course, the lower the better for our economy, because every time more dollars are spent on gasoline, the money goes out of the wallets of workers. But that's how the economy works. Let's hope the higher price stimulates production growth. Then the increase in production will help bring the price into balance. The market is what it is. The market decides, not the government. I would hope that Russia will encourage large investments to unlock the huge reserves it has. We need to do more exploration here. I spoke to the crown prince of Saudi Arabia, who assured me that he was trying to find more oil. That's what high prices do. But people who have oil need to understand that if the price gets too high, it could undermine the economy, which means less purchasing power for the product.

177

Good, calm and frank conversation. The president, the son of a front-line president, did justice to a former ally, and just at a time when a great many individuals, organizations and countries, mostly US clients, were competing in attacks on Russia. In essence, this interview with George W. Bush raises three interesting questions:

- 1) the Yalta model of the world structure;
- 2) World War II as a struggle for minority rights and tolerance;
- 3) oil.

Only the first question is directly related to the topic of this chapter (war and justice), but somehow it was a pity to interrupt George W. Bush. Quite frank (for any politician) conversation. However, questions No. 2 and No. 3 (minority rights and oil) will still have a chance to be touched upon, but for now, here is the answer to all Russophobes of the Baltics, the Czech Republic, etc.: the division of Europe into spheres of influence is a joint decision of the allies, it is necessary, generally recognized security measure in Europe at that time. Imagine: the bank tellers had a button to call the security, but they were afraid to press it at the time of the attack (Lithuania did not dare to turn to the guarantor countries, allowing Hitler to go through a significant part of his path - still within the framework of international law). This means that another system was needed, which Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin worked on.

Thus, Bush acknowledged Western co-authorship in the "Yalta project", but he could not drain the entire Baltic "puddle of hostility" with this. Of the heads of state who received him, everyone remembers the President of Latvia, Vaira Vike-Freiberga, who betrayed her feelings not only by her actual patronage of SS veterans, but also by the following passage:

"...they will lay out their vodka and herring on newspapers and sing their songs, remembering that they conquered Latvia..." (about Russian veterans)...

Reference. The first Occupation Museum appeared in Riga in 1993. Created on the site of the former Museum of the Red Latvian Riflemen. The main purpose of the museum: "To testify to what happened to Latvia and the Latvian people during the reign of the occupation authorities in 1940-1991." Most of the exposition is devoted to the period from 1940 to 1946. Process shown

178

inclusion of Latvia into the USSR, then the period of German occupation. The "Hitler" exposition is several times smaller than the paintings of the "Soviet occupation". And so much "Soviet history" is collected in the Riga Occupation Museum that in 2005 the museum was expanded, construction work should be completed in 2008. Now average: museum attendance: about 400 people per day day.

In 2005, the Russian Ambassador to Latvia Viktor Kalyuzhny visited the Occupation Museum in Riga. His assessment (left in the visitor's book): "The exposition is very one-sided, only one period of the history of Latvia, the Soviet one, sticks out, but it is also depicted exclusively in black colors."

In addition to the exposition itself, there is also a "circle of interests" in the building. Almost every year | April, the museum hosts an evening of anti-Soviet jokes. The Latvian authorities are very proud of their museum. For example, the President of Latvia, Vaira Vike-Freiberga, visiting the Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg (South Africa), told its staff that "there is a similar Museum of Occupation in Latvia" and expressed hope for a possible exchange of experience.

Ten years after the opening of the Museum of the Occupation in Riga, a similar museum was opened in Tallinn, where among the exhibits there are also "objects and documents related to the repressions against the civilian population of Estonia and deportations to Siberia in 1941 and 1949." According to the authorities, the project, which cost \$2.5 million, was financed by Olga Kistler-Ritso, a US citizen of Estonian origin, who left her homeland in 1944. For her help in opening the museum, she was awarded the highest award of the country's capital, the "Emblem of Tallinn".

Yes, the Washington principal during his 2005 tour explained some of the history of the Second World War to his Baltic clients, but they still have the "occupation of the times of tsarist Russia" in reserve, and one very well-known, especially to Protestants, the slogan put forward above in the title.

AMATEUR INQUIRIES Where was the nobleman then? And what does the "nobleman" have to do with it?

It was in the era of feudalism that the disciples of the first reformer, the forerunner of Protestantism, Wycliffe, basing all their social criticism on the Bible, put forward that famous, absolutely everyone

an understandable thesis, "slogan": "When Adam plowed the land, and Eve spun, where was the nobleman then?"

This thesis has entered the very fabric of Protestant culture, and I think there will be nothing offensive in using it to illustrate the next historical alignment.

179

Riga (which today, under the rule of President Vaira Vike-Freiberga, who complained about Russia in Johannesburg, fits the definition of "apartheid"), so this Riga was founded as a German city. And it remained so for many centuries. Latvians (Livs, Latgalians) could bring food to the markets, but they had no right to stay in the city for the night. More precisely, they had, if they could show a certificate that they were: 1) servants in German homes and... 2) "workers in merry homes" (famous throughout Northern Europe).

There were no Latvian quarters in Riga, but besides the German and Danish ones, there were Jewish quarters. It was the second main national community in the city (from this memory, most likely, the special zeal of the Latvian SS men in the work on the "final solution"). And at the moment when Peter the Great and the Swedes decided their affairs at the Nystadt Congress, any political Latvian nation simply did not exist. There was just a Swedish province, among whose peasants the Livs statistically predominated... and that was it. So, my question is quite in the spirit of the famous Protestant slogan:

— In the LUT century, when Janis was tending pigs and Marta was washing the floors, where was the Latvian nobleman then (or the Latvian senator, or at least the Latvian burgomaster of Riga)?

And in no case are we talking about any cultural backwardness of the Latvian nation – we are talking about its absence. As agricultural personnel, the population of Livonia was just distinguished by diligence, neatness and, in general, a higher culture of production. And actually the Latvian merchants, the intelligentsia, the "Latvian political nation" were formed only in the bosom of the Russian Empire. But I wonder what would have happened to them (the Latvian nation) if Hitler had won? His chief adviser on "racial organization" was just Rosenberg, an Eastsee German, and "that explains a lot" (as another slogan says). In any case, it would have to explain a lot to fifteen generations of him, the Baltic German Rosenberg, the Lettish and Estonian servants and maids. Well, if you had burned all the Jews, well, you would have done some more work (Sonderkommandos against the Belarusian partisans) - how long after that would they trust you to flaunt with the Schmeisers?

180

Necessary explanation. The above applies only to the Latvian fascists. And only two postulates can be addressed to the entire Latvian nation:

- 1) tsarist Russia did not take away your sovereignty;
- 2) The USSR - yes, it took away Latvian sovereignty, but ...

But I would suggest to Latvian historians to take a somewhat new look and objectively evaluate the following. Yes, sovereignty was taken away in 1940 and returned in 1991. The aberration of historical vision here is as follows: now, in the 2000s, national sovereignty, international law, human life seem to be such absolute values that this feeling is, as it were, carried over to 1940. But in reality, all these securities have their rates, floating. And what was the specific cost of national sovereignty in that year, 1940, you'd better ask your Baltic neighbors - the Danes, for example. Or the same Icelanders. Occupied by the British - just preventively ...

For example, after learning about the Allied agreement on the post-war inclusion of the Baltic republics in the USSR, Hitler immediately retorted: he declared them, Estonia and Latvia, "independent". What changed? Commandant's offices in Tallinn and Riga began to be called differently. What does it say

besides that the price of that Baltic "independence" is "pfennig on a market day"? (Yes, exactly, half a pfennig each for Estonia and Latvia.)

In 1991, of course, things were different. The weight, the "exchange rate" of national sovereignties has increased greatly. It's like... they picked up a bird in December and released it in April.

True, there was one more mutual burden: the construction of this strange socialism, which was not built in any way, was not "conquered". Either the Latvian riflemen helped us conquer it, or we helped them, but it's all useless... But this is only history (and not the closest one) that will judge and explain.

And another point on which, I confess, I do not have final information and which, it seems, has never been discussed. I suggest thinking about the following fact: already by 1943, Latvia was under Germany twice as long as in the USSR (August 1940 - July 1941), but ... The question, in fact, is this:

181

- And if we compare the presence (or absence) of heavy weapons in the national Latvian units that fought on both sides of the front? Perhaps such a formulation of the question seems atypical, even strange. But such is the general style of this book of mine: periodically interspersing ideological and abstract passages with purely material and mercantile passages like: how many tanks the Czechs riveted to the Germans, how many millions of liters of milk and wine the French gave them ...

AMATEUR INQUIRIES But really, who gave out, and who didn't, tanks and cannons to the Latvian units? And ... what follows from this ?!

The question of the presence of heavy weapons in the national units and, in general, the presence of Latvian pilots, artillerymen, tankers seems to me very important and indicative. Only light weapons testify to the predominantly punitive purpose of the detachments, and also testifies to distrust of the corresponding contingent. Submachine gunners, "cannon fodder" can be disarmed, taken under control, transferred somewhere easier than, for example, a military unit, a formation with artillery and tanks assigned to them. I repeat, I don't have complete information - only archival research of the most popular Latvian magazine Rodnik in the era of "perestroika", 1990. So, the Germans, it seems, gave the Latvians only "Schmeisers" and those same SS (or Gestapo?) badges that Waffen-SS veterans are so proud of at parades. And the USSR, having given the Latvians both cannons and tanks, formed the 130th Lettish Corps, which received the Order of Suvorov for the capture of Riga.

And the badges (Gestapo ones) - well, what are the badges?! — they hung on the collars of German shepherds too...

So, two questions to Latvians. What do you think are:

[1) the comparative cost of national sovereignty at the rate of 1940 and 1991;

2) what do the comparative measures of confidence I proposed above say, in such, perhaps, an original, but at the same time genuine (especially in wartime) dimension, as access to heavy weapons? (...)

182

And returning to the world of ideas. If you do not indulge in some kind of geographical dreams: oh, if it were not the Baltic, but the warm Mediterranean Sea, and most importantly, on the other side of the Iron Curtain! Or dreams' chronological: oh, if after May 1945 ... suddenly and immediately December 1991. The USSR accepts the surrender of Germany and immediately announces self-dissolution! It would be great ... after all, there is a saying about the "Moor", so the Russians would do just that ...

It is possible that on the basis of such "literary dreams" the Commission of Historians of Latvia was created.

Reference: The Commission of Latvian Historians was founded on November 13, 1998 on the initiative of the former president of the country, G. Ulmanis. It began its work at the end of 1998 with 11 members. The commission included professional historians from the Institute of History of the University of Latvia, the Faculty of History and Philosophy of the University of Latvia, the State Historical Archive, the Museum of the Occupation, and employees of the Chancellery of the President of the country. The chairman of the commission is the director of the Institute of History, Professor Andris Caune. In cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, foreign members of the commission were selected and included in the composition of the commission. Commission meetings with the participation of foreign members are held twice a year. The involvement of foreign scientists and public figures contributes to the objectivity of the work of the commission, and also allows you to get better acquainted with the historical research methods developed in the West.

The main task of the commission is to study and comprehend the topic "Crimes against humanity during the two occupations of 1940-1956." and organizing the development of the final report.

4 working groups have been created, acting independently of each other in the following areas:

- 1) crimes against humanity in the territory of Latvia in 1940-1941. (supervisor prof. V. Berzinysh);
- 2) Holocaust in Latvia 1941-1944 (Head - Prof. A. Strang);
- 3) crimes against humanity on the territory of Latvia during the Nazi occupation of 1941-1944. (supervisor — Prof. I. Feldmanis);

183

- 4) crimes against humanity in Latvia during the Soviet occupation of 1944-1956. (supervisor - Prof. H. Strods).

Our deputy of the State Duma of the Russian Federation, Deputy Chairman of the Committee on International Affairs of the State Duma Natalia Narochnitskaya, in 2005, congratulating the President of the Republic of Latvia, Mrs. Vaira Vike-Freiberga, wrote to her:

"This Victory saved the Latvian people from disappearing from world history, from the fate of turning from a nation into a faceless human material, into servants for the masters from the Third Reich, who can barely read geographical signs in German in Ingermanland. In the subsequent period, Latvians, like Russians and other peoples of the historical Russian state, experienced their share of everything that was in our common Fatherland - good and bad, but they became professors, inventors and generals, received state awards for the achievements of national culture. missions, preserved themselves as a nation.

I sincerely hope that the Latvian people, with their wisdom and dignity, will overcome the stage of self-affirmation based on a sweeping denial of the past and enmity towards Russia (...)".

And in continuation of this just and conciliatory letter, which, unfortunately, remained unanswered, I will give brief excerpts from the work of the Commission of Historians of Latvia with my own, conciliatory, I hope, commentary.

1. Abstract of Professor Inesis Feldmanis. "The occupation policy of Nazi Germany in Latvia in the light of German archival documents":

"..the question of the autonomy of Latvia and Estonia. In the autumn of 1943, some high officials of the Nazis, for example, Reichsführer \$55 G. Himmler, expressed the idea of the need to give Latvia and Estonia state independence. This idea was strongly supported by G. Berger, Head of the \$5 Main Directorate, and O. Drexler, Commissioner General of Latvia. The Ministry of the Occupied Eastern Districts even prepared a draft

decree of the Fuhrer on the state independence of Latvia and Estonia, and Minister A. Rozenberg ordered to develop a plan for the liquidation

184

tion of the Reichskommissariat "O \$ Napa". In turn, some German diplomats advised to present the act of granting autonomy to Latvia and Estonia as a response to the conference of foreign ministers held in Moscow in October 1943. German intelligence received information that at this conference the British and US Foreign Ministers A. Eden and K. Hull de Asus recognized the inclusion of the Baltic countries into the USSR.

On the other hand, the idea of autonomy had powerful opponents. Reichskommissar H. Lohse and German Foreign Minister Ribbentrop opposed the granting of autonomy to Latvia and Estonia. Many documents testify that it was Ribbentrop's position that had a great influence on Hitler, who in the end made a negative decision (...)."

Mr. Feldmanis, in your abstract, the very course of the Germans' thoughts about: "Why not give the Latvians autonomy" is honestly and vividly illustrated. All their "pros and cons" are given. Agree, that not only in the quoted fragments, but also everywhere the spirit reigns... I would say, a completely official, "applied" understanding of the Latvian autonomy by the Germans (for example, in defiance of the decisions of 1943 of the allies in Moscow). And what if we supplement your abstract with another, completely unambiguous assessment of Hitler: "The independence of the Baltic states and Ukraine in [918] is the work of our (German) hands"?

How can you argue? In 1918, the Germans squeezed the Russian, and then the Red Army out of the Baltic states, and for purely economic needs, for better organization of the work of the rear, they declare the "independence" of Latvia and Estonia. That is probably why they so easily returned it (Baltic "independence") to Russia under the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact.

It turns out that the "Baltic sovereignties" are our, German products, we gave them, and we re-gifted them to whomever we wanted! And in 1943, if we want it, we will give it to the Latvians again!

Agree that such "sovereignty" is one of the small (and rather small) German coins. This is not something to be proud of and on which to base Russia's space accounts for 1940.

185

2. Lecture by Dr. Irene Schneidere "The policy of the occupation regime of the Soviet Union in Latvia: in the light of Russian archives" (summary).

"... Only thanks to the financial support of the Commission of Historians, after a long break, Latvian historians managed to "return" to the archives of Moscow. They could not only work there with documents, but also order copies. Scientists get acquainted with the received materials, the documents are published and widely used in scientific articles. However, I would like to start not with a review of documents, but with a brief description of the conditions in which I had to work. Work in the archives of Moscow, unfortunately, cannot be called normal for a number of reasons. My observations stem from my travel experiences over the past three years.

Has anything changed in the work of archives since the 1980s? As far as I can tell, little, if anything, has changed. Yes, the former Central Party Archive became available, which was practically closed to researchers before. Now this archive is called the Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History (GASPI).

I would like to say a few words about the specific aspects of the work. I'll start with the circumstances that complicate the work. The work of historians is influenced by personal attitude towards them.

archive staff. Muscovites are great patriots, so they certainly believe their mayor Yuri Luzhkov, who talks about apartheid, the infringement of Russians in Latvia. Powerful propaganda has an impact on the inhabitants of the capital of Russia.

Since the last years of the era of Boris Yeltsin, declassification commissions have not been working in the archives. Strange things happen to secret documents. The former Central Party Archive has fund 600, the Bureau of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, which in the first post-war years "looked after", that is, controlled the structures of power in the Latvian SSR. The fund contains 28 cases, of which 10 are inaccessible to researchers. However, it turned out that they were issued to some foreign researchers. This can be judged from the footnotes in the works of our foreign colleagues. Absolutely incomprehensible differentiated approach.

186

The working conditions are also bad: microfilms are very difficult to read, the number of cases ordered is unreasonably small (only 5 cases).

At the same time, I would like to emphasize that, for example, in SASPI, the work is greatly facilitated by a carefully compiled inventory, already by the name of the case one can judge whether there will be something about Latvia. This certainly makes the job easier, especially with such a huge fund.

After such a not very optimistic introduction, the question arises: was there any point in going, wasting time, money, nerves? The answer is three times yes. Valuable, even unique documents about Latvia during the Soviet occupation were obtained from the archives of Moscow.

... The plan of socialist construction included the deportation of the "foreign element", the collectivization of agriculture, and special attention was paid to the fight against the church. There is only one conclusion that can be drawn - the work must be continued, because the archives of Moscow are just beginning to reveal their secrets.

... In my opinion, essential documents revealing the processes of 1940-1941. and the real intentions of Moscow are kept in the fund of V. Molotov. I would like to note only one point: in June 1940, the leadership of Moscow expected armed resistance to the Soviet occupation, but not from the army, but from the Aizsargs. This, to a certain extent, explains why it was against the members of this organization that mass repressions were carried out (...).

And your lecture, Mrs. Irene Schneidere, bears a share of a completely fair assessment of the current working conditions of historians in Russia. Even if Russian archivists are angry with the Latvian discrimination against their compatriots in Riga and somehow discriminate against you, all the same, you must admit that this is not some kind of "conspiracy of total lies" in the spirit of Orwell's "Ministry of Truth"?!

The fund contains 28 cases, of which [0] are not available to researchers (Latvian). However, it turned out that they were issued to some foreign researchers. This can be judged from the footnotes in the works of our foreign colleagues. Absolutely incomprehensible differentiated
an approach.

187

That's exactly what differentiated, and not "total"! That is, if Russia planned, for example, to hide some information tightly, create a fake and use it to carry out some kind of disinformation anti-Latvian attack, how can all this be built on closing the archives only for Latvians and ... preserving (as confirmed by) access to Americans and Swedes?! After all, taking "these secrets" from them, you even more confidently fend off such a (hypothetical) attack ...

In general, is the fate of one Baltic republic really so terrible, which bloodlessly lost its sovereignty and regained it without a single shot, to the singing of beautiful folk songs

nationwide millionth choir? The whole world was then broadcasting the “singing Latvian revolution”. (By the way, do they sing at the stadiums now? It's also interesting: are hundreds of thousands going to sing just now, without protests?) After all, there is its own unique pattern, beauty in such a fate. And if some Latvian suddenly reads the book up to this point (despite the things two pages ago that may seem offensive), then he may say: here it is, the propaganda of “stupid Russian resignation to fate.”

But it was precisely the aristocrat of the spirit, Friedrich Nietzsche, who formulated the main conclusion (slogan) of his philosophy in relation to a person/society in this way: “Amor fati (Love for fate)!” And he gave an explanation (which turned out to be, among other things, also the most accurate forecast for our entire twentieth century): “There is nothing more terrible than the class of barbarian slaves who have learned to treat their existence as an injustice and are now preparing to take revenge not only for yourself, but also for all generations.”

To carry such a disease within oneself and overcome it— isn't that a lofty fate?

No, a real reproach, which should be feared in line with the topic “World War II. Reboot” is not “stupid resignation to fate”, it is a reproach of a completely different kind. Approximately so it has already been voiced more than once: “// it turns out that if Russia is the only country that held the front against Hitler, it will always and forever be right: in Yalta-45, and in Prague-68, and all your stupid politicians will always right in everything, and we will have to owe them

188

sow corn in Kurzeme, and build socialism in Afghanistan, and so on. - then how will Russia be better than the German yoke we have escaped?

Chapter 16

SIX FEATHERS FROM EACH KINGDOM GOOSE

(War and Justice)

The first, “superficial” layer of this syllogism (“Then why is the USSR better than Hitler?”) is purely demagogic, almost journalistic overlap, easily refuted. Comparing our mistakes with “Hitler's great thousand-year plan” is the logic of an offended, angry and very narrow-minded child. “Here they will burn all these, and those, and even those - and only then - all of them. And they will open in Auschwitz and Salaspils - mmm ... Luna Park! Or... “Hitlerland” with ice cream...

But there is also a “second” layer, wow, real and most difficult questions. Where does the savior's right end? What is a “just order of the world”? And how do the post-war years slowly turn into ... pre-war ones? Non-warring countries — they can, of course, liken themselves and the whole world to a pretty, plump girl rescued from a fire, with a gallant bow given to her parents, and that's all ... You can only ... except perhaps your telephone to leave to parents, but so, unobtrusively: “Call somehow - how is our saved ...” Such a savior (and only such a savior in PACE), of course, everyone would gladly accept. What can you say? Yes, the USSR turned out to be such a gallant savior for HER. But the fact that a certain part of European politicians allow themselves such, almost erotic dreams (a savior, a gift of a rose, a hand outstretched for a kiss, a passionate romance) actually means their desire to still not grow up (like Peter Pan). This is not romanticism, as it may seem, but their very selfish bargaining for themselves rights - in real, sometimes even military history, options like: “OH, I was joking!”, “No, I don't play like that!”. So, on occasion, they will again allow their Disneyland to be turned into a Hitler

189

land” and will again allow us to save them – on their terms!

resolution on "equality of fascism and Stalinism", these are such ... PACE lovers of "role-playing games" ... In the end, the dispute of this chapter is not with them.

But really, how to realize the true limits of responsibility? When (and where) did the inner rightness and justice of the USSR disappear?

So, the imperfection of "Versailles" and the injustice of "Munich" pushed the world to the beginning of the Great War. The Soviet Union, like a real hero of ancient tragedies, took upon itself all the blows of fate, all the evil and all the responsibility - and won.

But who here was going to build a system of European settlement - on the "eternal gratitude of the saved"? Certainly not such a wise politician as Stalin. All his post-war speeches, reports, even toasts ("For the great Russian people!") are carefully codified and studied long ago. But there are two of his "immediately post-war" statements that seem to me the most visionary and directly related to the enumerated difficult issues of this chapter. They, these statements, are also, in general, known, certified by many witnesses, but, however, were not included in any collection of his works. Therefore, they are cited by witnesses "not to the point, not to the comma", but something like this:

J. "In this war, we lost the best. And it will certainly have an impact."

G. "Without theory, we will perish."

It is clear why the "neighbors", who were in charge of shorthand and publishing the "Collected Works of I.V. Stalin", never included this "apocryphal" anywhere. They just were - from those "unlost" ...

But before touching on these very ... "not the best of the best": both the corn guardian and the mumbling collector of orders and medals, let's return first to the title.

.. "6 feathers from each goose of the kingdom (War and justice) ".

190

Being well aware of how boring the reader has become over the past 25 years with these many images, with the help of which they try to illustrate similar military-political syllogisms, I will try to at least give an example from the deck that has not yet been overwritten. |

It took place in the era of Henry the Fifth, the winner at Agincourt, the conqueror of France, the best and most successful king of England (according to the majority of British historians). In the Hundred Years' Anglo-French War, just a break came, prudently used by the British to unleash their internal, civil war. The reigning Henry Wu pacifies and reunites the country under the slogan "France will be ours!" The then proportions of those kingdoms in terms of population, power, size of armies correlated approximately like ... a ferret with a deer. But after some preparations, England (the ferret) rushed in and defeated the stag-France (temporarily, of course).

And in the history of Henry the Fifth, the work of Desmond Steward, I was struck by one absolutely passing technical detail of the preparation for that great expedition. Archers, as you know, were the main striking force of the British, arrows (more than a million pieces) were harvested and transported in barrels. And the plumage of arrows then really served as feathers. Exactly the same ones that served the poets - goose. And here is just one line in Steward's book (there was a routine about measures to prepare the ships):

"[Enrich the Fifth issued a decree: "To the sheriffs in the entire English kingdom, pluck 6 feathers from the wings of each goose."

Here it is, the idea of military justice in an ingeniously simple form, in the most visual form. "The feudal society of England," as any textbook will tell you, "had a very complex structure." Hierarchy of vassalage, a complex system of privileges, but here is a royal decree - strictly 3 feathers from each English goose wing. Mobilization of all England. Extremely simple and fair. And even if it turns out that 12 feathers were torn out of some goose, and not a single one of some, then all of England - correctly - will understand this as an accidental exception, as a crime, corruption ... of the district military commissariats that carried out

191

conscription... That is, I, of course, misspoke, I wanted to say - not district military commissariats, but "sheriffs".

And a few months later, 5,000 English archers scattered at Agincourt a 20,000-strong French army (knights, servants, heralds, squires...).

Here is an example of a just, popular (perhaps even domestic) war on the part of England. Maybe this is my definition, again, it will seem unusual ... wild, but here is such a comment. This is unusual for us, Russians, because in our country the concepts of "people's", "patriotic" war are connected, inextricably merged with defensive war, "defense", "salvation" of the Fatherland. But for other countries and nations, especially such ... more mobile, mostly coastal, people's, domestic war can also become a war of conquest. The main thing is the presence/absence of an idea that really unites the nation. Capturing booty, capturing new territory... It's hard for us to imagine that "such ideas" can unite the whole people. But then the Scandinavians rose up and captured a third of Europe, founded several kingdoms. The Aragonese rose up and took over half of Italy. The Germans - "Drang nach Osten". The Normans rose up and took over England. By the way, this described case, when they (the Normans), soldering with the British into a new nation, after 400 years, led by Henry the Fifth, captured France, was noted in the chronicles of that time as "the reverse conquest of Normandy >.

What does this have to do with Russia (apart from any hints and comparisons of the current practice of our "district military commissars" and Heinrich's "sheriffs")?

Of course, any people's war also implies some kind of people's self-organization, but only a "people's war of conquest" requires organization and self-organization two orders of magnitude greater than a "people's liberation" war. We need to gather, dive, move. And most importantly, after the victory in the "people's war of conquest" it is necessary to share not only the contents of the captured carts, but also ... land, real estate. And the division of this already implies a new organization of life, work in the occupied territories - otherwise this production has neither meaning nor value. Henry the English Fifth conquered

192

only the title of King of France, and his people received both solid movable and immovable property. And this means lists, registers, contracts, amendments to lease agreements, land cadastres (and, by the way, when did we hear this ominous word - "land cadastre"?).

The trophies of the people in the also won, but defensive, saving national-patriotic war are only carts, 99% with belongings stolen a little earlier from it, the people. Well, plus some souvenirs from Paris or Berlin. And the division, the redistribution of this kind of booty (called "pull") it does not require self-organization is more difficult than "Bratkovo".

A handful of Cossacks conquered Siberia for the people remained a place of exile and hard labor. And the Cossacks are just an exception, the only corporation self-organized by the people. And there was this exception precisely because the Cossacks also needed to divide the land in the lower reaches of the Dnieper, Don, Yaik, settle down, organize life. To complete the picture, I would personally suggest another look-compare the Cossacks with ushkuyniki. Unfortunately, this last "corporation" with us

little known, but take my word for it. Absolutely the same courage, enterprise, and even the same tactics. Gathered from Novgorod Veliky to approximately Nizhny Novgorod gang. They sat down in boats, called only not "boats" (as with Stenka Razin), but "ears", and made raids. Their journeys to Astrakhan, Azov were recorded, and there were probably more distant campaigns. But the matter did not reach the division of land among the Ushkuins, in view of the then historical (Golden Horde) situation.

And there was no people's memory about the ushkuiniki, and, which is typical, there were no songs about them. On the other hand, the Cossacks themselves, breaking away from their villages for a long time, became slightly similar to ... right, to the same ushkuiniks. Remember Stenka Razin.

So, it must be admitted that we had no experience of conquering people's campaigns. And, as a result, they had no experience in organizing civil life in the conquered countries. This is not a natural defect (the Cossacks just prove that the nation had such necessary natural abilities) - this, as they say, is a "historical given". Therefore,

193

having saved themselves and the world from Napoleon/Hitler, having accomplished a bunch of heroic deeds, our people fall into... What other word is closely connected with the epithet "heroic"? That's right, you can't deceive the tongue: "a heroic dream."

And as you know, "the sleep of reason gives birth to monsters." This is what I mean by the fact that a certain mysterious substance — "justice" — has been slowly decreasing and melting since 1945. It was not possible to establish a fair and stable order in the "conquered territories". And who personally formalized this process, "headed" this drift? What environment brought forward the leader of the USSR in an era when "the best are lost in the war"?

The answer to this question is at the same time the answer to the main possible reproach: "If you succeed all the time: he is more right, who fought Hitler more, then until when will it be? The USSR alone held the front against Hitler - which, from this, means that Brezhnev will be the smartest and most right-wing in the world for a third of a century? When do these uncertain post-war years end (and pre-war years begin)?"

Consider this phrase, or if you like, the prophecy: "In this war, we lost the best. And it will certainly have an effect" - you can do it indefinitely. You may as well not think of anything. It seems to me that attempts to interpret it will be more effective - in parallel with the interpretation of "prophecy No. 2": "Without theory, we will perish."

But the circumstances of the utterance of this phrase are known more or less accurately. This was said by Stalin to the newly elected member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the philosopher D.I. Chesnokov. Even these isolated facts themselves - the election of the philosopher Chesnokov to the Presidium of the Central Committee (the then temporary equivalent of the Politburo) and Stalin's appeal to him - already deserve much more attention. And it is very characteristic that the "perestroika" publicists, who scanned all the lineups of the then party elite up and down, including the already tragically beaten one hundred times "Shepilov who joined them", did not stop looking at this interlocutor of Stalin, the philosopher Chesnokov, external addressee of those, in general, strange and mysterious words.

Mysterious? Let me remind you that the matter took place "in the country of the victorious theory (teaching) of Marx... all-powerful, because he is true"... and so on. It won't be an exaggeration to say

194

that 99.9% of the population were sure that "we already have a theory!" The absence of many other things was just compensated by the certainty that everything was going according to the only right one... And certainly all 100% of the population were sure: to doubt that "Marxism is the most comprehensive result of the development of human thought... x, is a true "tower".

So without what theory "we (it is clear from the context that the USSR - I.Sh.) will perish"?

A sufficient (perhaps already critical) mass of studies and works of serious scientists is already being collected, which will provide one important revolution in the minds of our fellow citizens. Grigory Khanin, in a conversation with Lev Anninsky on the pages of Rodina magazine, reveals some contours of a new look at the history of the country in the second half of the 20th century. This also coincides with the main meaning of the works of the historian Mukhin.

Stalin's "new program" included:

- 1) relaxation of international tension;
- 2) publicity;
- 3) limited democracy, primarily in the party;
- 4) improving the life of the population;
- 5) decentralization of the economy.

The evidence for this is the most serious. A lot of things do not even need to be revealed - you just need to stop hushing up. Like, for example, the great reform of the party in the late 1940s. The transport and agricultural departments of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks were liquidated, and the functions of control over sectoral departments were eliminated from the duties of secretaries of the Central Committee. Departments responsible only for the selection of personnel and ideology were left in the apparatus of the Central Committee. The party was removed from the direct management of the economy. After all, these are, in fact, all the points of the "hard struggle for the democratization of public life in 1989-1991" - this alone explains the reasons for such a total silence: it turns out that the "zealots", "rate-setters" of "Leninist norms", figures of the era Sakharov-Karyakin was copied from himself (democratic language does not dare to pronounce whom)...

In international life - concessions in Korea, containment of the aggressive plans of foreign Communist Parties. The strongest irritant for the West, the Cominform (the successor to the Third International) actually stops its activities. As soon as the new program of the Communist Party of Great Britain became

195

loyal (peaceful parliamentary path to socialism, preservation of the private sector), it was published in the Bolshevik magazine (1951).

G. Khanin:

Stalin was a pragmatist. He came to the conclusion that due to the successes of the USSR in military technology, the huge expansion of the socialist camp after the victory of the Chinese revolution (1949), the period of survival for our country ended. Further success depended on the ability of the system to promote the initiative and creativity of citizens, which was hindered by the totalitarian system (...)

The removal of the party nomenklatura layer by Stalin was prepared so far in advance that only today fragments of this plan are being collected and identified. Like encouraging a critical approach in literature. According to Simonov, Stalin especially scolded the "theory of non-conflict", and linked the requirement of "party membership of writers" with the last period of the struggle for power and today declared it invalid.

Well, all the well-known publications of Ovechkin, Vera Panova in Novy Mir and Pravda in 1952 testify to the same thing. The popular expression "we need Gogols, Shchedrins" (later parodied "...and such Gogols so that they don't touch us") is, after all, from Stalin's speech at the

Committee for the award of the Stalin Prizes in 1952. Yuri Zhdanov (son, scientist) remembers how, in the summer of 1952, Malenkov conveyed Stalin's order: to liquidate Lysenko's monopoly in biological science, to introduce Lysenko's opponents, primarily Tsitsin and Zhebrak, into the presidium of the All-Russian Academy of Agricultural Sciences.

Kaganovich testifies that at the next (it turns out, at the 20th - strange to even imagine!) congress, Stalin planned to make a serious and self-critical report. And he could, frankly speaking, and vice versa, let the entire composition of the Twentieth Congress (1952) ... follow the KhUP - for him it would be a matter of tactics rather. One thing is certain: 20-year-old lethargy like Brezhnev's was not part of Stalin's plans. And the landmark "doctors' case", as it eventually went, was the trap of the nomenklatura for Stalin - this is also given strong evidence.

It is interesting how arguments such as Ovechkin's essays and peace talks on Korea, Ryumin's removal, Chesnokov's Jewish wife and

196

Stalin's consent to the unification of Germany. A serious sign of peace for Stalin was the removal in April 1951 of the Commander-in-Chief of the US troops in the Far East (the main hot spot), General MacArthur, the main supporter of nuclear war with the USSR |

Further, to leave according to a fully developed "flow chart", proving that Stalin was preparing a new course like the Teng Xiaoping, Pinochet, Frankist, is certainly interesting, but still it means moving away from the main topic of this book. Let's leave only the conclusion; Stalin thought for a long time about the idea of a post-war arrangement of life in the USSR, and in the huge sphere of influence he received, he understood that the former state structure and the party (created for the seizure of power and for survival) were no longer suitable. His conclusions (with the absence of a theory!), of course, were not included in any published work, but could be (if one steps from the generally recognized pragmatism of Stalin to pragmatic provisions) approximately as follows:

1. Russia did not have a positive experience in organizing life in the conquered territories. And Siberia? What about "one-sixth"? And this is just an indirect proof (from the contrary) of the Eurasianists being right. There was no capture as such (like the Germans - Prussia, the Baltic states) on our "one-sixth". It was, as it is right, it turns out, they write, "the entry into the inheritance in the Dzhuchiev Ulus (Volga region, Urals, Siberia)". Change of the Genghisid dynasty - Rurikovich. And, which is characteristic, it was these "Juchi" acquisitions that ultimately remained after all the collapses.

2. Communism, as an organizational support (through the system of "fraternal parties") and as a unifying idea, might be useful, but in a completely different form.

We can only guess: what contours would our life, our empire, if ... "we did not die without a theory." Before the mind's eye rises like an unknown, undiscovered continent.

Approximately in the same way, Octavian August laid the Course of World History - also through completely unexplored lands. His empire, first through the "principate", was also built very slowly, gradually, preserving the entire republican lexicon.

197

The title "Emperor" that we remember was one of many titles, and not the most important one. It was a purely intra-legionary honorary title. And Power gave the title "Princeps of the Senate", personal immunity and the right of veto - the position of tribune (moreover, the original meaning of the three bun positions - protection of the plebeians - was simply forgotten, the very line disappeared: patricians / plebeians).

The most important guarantee of the stability of power was the membership of the "Emperor" in the priestly colleges (two or three main ones). Marcus Aurelius (famous philosopher and considered the best monarch in the history of mankind) was a "salus" (leaper). These priests jumped, repeating phrases whose meaning

was lost 800-900 years before. The "haruspices" guessed by the insides... But the most famous priestly college is the "augurs". From them came not only the "inauguration", but also the expression "to look at each other and laugh like augurs". It was believed, or rather suspected, that the augurs themselves laughed at their divination among themselves. Preserving, however, all forms of reverence for the ancient tradition and accommodating the labyrinths of myth, the rational view, and the state need...

And the Communist Stalin, addressing the Communist Chesnokov: "We need a theory," I also see him as a bit of an augur. Maybe the members of the Politburo would become such augurs, "jumpers" on the Mausoleum, fortune-tellers according to the Holy Book "Capital". (Adjusted for the acceleration of world history, these would not have been Roman centuries, but ours, maybe ... "five-year plans".) Marxism, communism would probably have taken ritual forms ...

Then this is the main reason for "Stalin's ruthless extermination of revolutionaries, loyal and talented Marxists, loyal and talented Leninists"... and then see the Ogonyok magazine...

There were twelve augurs in Rome, ten haruspices (or vice versa).

But what kind of state could withstand the feeding and attempts to "lead" hundreds of thousands of "faithful and talented" (and therefore self-confident) carriers of an inoperative theory?! Solid guardians of the unsuccessful ... "weather forecast for the post-yesterday"?! Having memorized "Capital", the last chapters of which

198

already Engels was finishing writing, twisting Marx's theories to fit the realities that had changed over several years. Of course, it would be better, of course, it would be better, more rational, and simply more humane to send them ("prominent Marxists") to be pig farmers, janitors, builders, than "to the wall" ... BUT what happened happened, and choose the reason - which one you like more - out of two:

1) terrible cruelty of Stalin;

2) the ambitions of our "prominent Marxists" or "faithful Leninists".

Chinese "prominent Marxists" for the most part still went to agricultural communes, "for re-education." Deng Xiaoping and thousands of his party comrades-in-arms worked during the repressions of Mao Zedong (Deng Xiaoping did not work in a pigsty, it's true, he worked in a cowshed), but - tell me honestly! — can you even for a moment imagine Trotsky and those others in the barn?..

In general, the post-war "Stalin's plan" has yet to be unraveled, mainly from some indirect evidence, a small part of which was given by G. Khanin...

The line of Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Chernenko that prevailed in the end is just... Nothing to compare with! remembering the owner...

Andropov alone looked around in surprise: "We don't know the country in which we live!"

The ideological reserve, the "reserve of justice", born of the people's war, a special kind of intellectual energy, was gradually drying up. All the Soviet Union really needed was security. The sphere of influence, it is also the sphere of security. That is why it will be so important to cite the most important, most fundamental documents of that era: Churchill's "Fulton speech", the declaration of war ("cold") against us, and Stalin's answers in the Pravda newspaper of March 14, 1946.

AMATEUR INQUIRIES

And why is there even a discussion of the "justice" of the war, of the post-war arrangement? Isn't "fair" a meaningless abstract, unscientific epithet (like "beloved", "cute"), inapplicable in such matters?

199

Nothing can be proved in a hundred lines, you can only point (to) ... That is, again, the most correct answer would be a reference to the leading scientific authorities. If the military, diplomats and lawyers have been using the works of Hugo Grotius for 350 years, right up to their direct inclusion in the texts of international conventions like Geneva, then the following should be briefly said. Hugo Grotius, in his treatise *On the Law of War and Peace*, introduced definitions (as strict as possible in this area) of just and unjust wars. Moreover, these definitions are derived on the basis of the very important concept of "natural law" developed by him. Which, in turn, arose from the very reasonable and fruitful Grotius division of the right into "natural" and "domestic":

"The peculiarity of human nature is a controlled, rational desire for communication, which is the source of natural law. The mother of natural law is nature itself person."

In addition to the natural law, there is a volitional law: the law of peoples and state law (...)

In the following, I will cite only theses from Grotius.

1. The criterion for assessing the justice of war is the observance of natural law. Here the main idea, it seems to me, is the criterion for evaluating wars, the criterion for the justice of a war - NOT the right of peoples, NOT the right of the state (since different peoples and states fight, and everyone has their own state law) ...

2. There is a distinction between justifying (pretexts) and motivating (actual causes) wars. Prepositions are always obvious, reasons must be identified ...

3. "... for a defense to be just, it must be necessary."

4. For just public wars Grotius introduced the definition of "solemn wars". (Definition of public war - see chapter.)

O. An interesting particular variant: Grotius brought out cases when war is fair on both sides. (But this, perhaps, will still be useful, for example, for assessing the First Chechen War ...)

200

6. Distinguish wars that arose for an unjust cause, and wars in which vice came from outside, and as a result of this also became unjust ... (And this, in fact, what? - this is evidence that the nature of war can change in its course - another good argument in my collection of Clausewitz's rebuttals, his postulate, actually most harmful for the USSR, about war as a continuation of politics by other means...).

If the pathos of the first chapters of the book is expressed in the slogan "Adolf Hitler as a trustee of CJSC 'Europe' and all German apprentices are canceled forged 'certificates of participation in the Resistance movement'" (more precisely, the Largest Certificate taken from the archive is placed on top of the table, about the Greatest Resistance Movement — German), then these comparisons must be brought to their logical end and admitted: "Yes, in the USSR, too, the measure of participation in the war was different for different strata."

Let us say at once and frankly: we are talking first of all about one interesting stratum—the "political workers"—and its further stratification. As is known, in 1943, with the abolition of the institution of commissars, the party was finally removed from the direct leadership of military operations. (And the "exploits" of Commissar Mekhlis in the Crimea still deserve a separate perpetuation, maybe someday they will put up a monument, a kind of allegory: "Loudness and stupidity reaching the stars.") And in one more question, "education of the masses", the party was, though not removed, but pushed back, sharing this function with the restored Church. And now this strange "last child" remained: "political officer", "political instructor". Here, however, clarifications are needed. The "political officer" of a company, battalion is the same soldier, only more important and responsible, "lifting into the attack", etc. "Zampolit" of the regiment, division - it happened in different ways. But above - this, as a rule, is the very "happy" category, confirming that you can "get settled" everywhere. "To whom - war, to whom: - mother is dear". Probably, this is the "law of life": well, in any, the most terrible war, a kind of "bosom" will be found. Do not go on the attack, but do not answer for the leadership either. Brought up the crusts of party cards, stamped the third visa on award

201

lists (do not forget to insert the last name ... your own, embodying the "role of the party"). And you can sleep happily, probably not even thinking that in the meantime "the world is being conquered for you"... And while the Mekhlis and Brezhnevs are dozing in the political departments of the armies and fronts on packs of Pravda, the steps are being cleared, "the best are dying". Now we come to the question formulated 10 pages ago: what environment brought forward the leader of the USSR in an era when "the best are lost in the war"?

"There are three oaks in each part: political officer, partor, head of the club!" - I still found this saying of Marshal Zhukov. I testify that in 1975-1977 this aphorism was repeated with evil pleasure by the entire army. But what did the "sheepskin coat" answer to Marshal Zhukov (this is how "Lenka's oak" was played up in one joke)? ..

Dismissed, Marshal Zhukov wrote a book. Memories. His truth about the war. I gave the manuscript to the publisher. Years of silence passed. And now, having toiled in anticipation, Georgy Konstantinovich Zhukov asks Kosygin for help: "I don't even know where my manuscript is, I sent a letter to Brezhnev for the last time. No answer, no hello. Here is the original of that letter:

"Dear Leonid Ilyich!

I turn to you with a request. In 1965 I completed the development of my memoirs, which I had been working on for several years. In the autumn of 1965, I handed over the manuscript to the APN publishing house.

According to reports, the manuscript was transferred to the department of the Central Committee of the CPSU comrade. D. P. Shevlyagin. Much time has passed, and the fate of my manuscript is unknown to me.

I beg you, Leonid Ilyich, to give instructions on the publication of my manuscript. I would very much like to publish a book for the 50th anniversary of the Soviet Army.

Marshal of the Soviet Union Zhukov. December 11, 1967".

Here is his next letter to Brezhnev and Kosygin:

"Dear Leonid Ilyich! Alexey Nikolaevich!

A lot of time has passed since the APN prepared the book "Memoirs and Reflections". All remarks and wishes of the reviewers were taken into account.

202

I know that the department of the Central Committee of the CPSU (comrade Stepanov) gave its very positive opinion on my manuscript.

I am extremely saddened by the inexplicable delay in the publication of the book. After all, this is the work of my long life.

I beg your intervention.

Sincerely, Marshal of the Soviet Union G. Zhukov. February 23, 1968".

Kosygin promised to help. And, probably, he would have kept his promise, but there was a barrier beyond his control. Mirkina (an employee of the publishing house) spoke about this obstacle:

"Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev wished Marshal Zhukov to mention him in his book. But the trouble is, in all the years of the war they never met on any front. How to be? And then a "way out" was found. Being near Novorossiysk, Marshal Zhukov supposedly went to consult with Colonel Brezhnev, but, unfortunately, he was not there (such a way out was thought up and formulated in the editorial office). "A smart man will understand," said the marshal with a bitter smile. This absurd phrase appeared in all editions of Reminiscences and Reflections, from the first to the sixth inclusive, as well as in foreign editions. Only in the seventh edition it was omitted..."

The layout was signed for printing on December 24, 1968. The workers in the printing house were told that the marshal was ill and it would be good to release the book as soon as possible. One of the printers exclaimed:

Yes, we will work around the clock! Zhukov and I fought against the Nazis, we are ready to work in three shifts even for free!

In March, Mirkina grabbed the first warm copy that got out of the car of the printing house of the Pravda newspaper and rushed to Zhukov's dacha.

"Georgy Konstantinovich put the book on the table and looked at it silently for a long time... The marshal worked on its creation for almost ten years. For three years the finished manuscript lay in the "authorities". And so the book was born. It is difficult to convey the feeling of a person who finally holds his book in his hands. To do this, you must be its author. Sometimes the birth of a book is compared to the birth of a child. It seems. This is also a child. It is born in pain and brings great joy, satisfaction

203

and relief. Zhukov's book was published in 27 countries (by 1988), in 18 languages, millions of copies sold out very quickly. It is not difficult to imagine what a resonance this book caused in the press, what a huge stream of letters poured into Zhukov's address. Georgy Konstantinovich definitely looked younger. The success of the book added to his health and vigor. A huge mail with thanks, advice, criticism and wishes prompted the marshal to immediately prepare the second editions..."

What can be added here? The only thing is that I have given this fragment not for "malice and slander" for the sake of, but there will be one more plot twist, with reference to the mention of Afghanistan and the "prohibition".

This is the very essence of the paradoxical alignment: "The Great War" is a catharsis, a source of new thoughts about a just world order, produces an effect of purifying suffering on a person, but, naturally, to the extent that a person has touched this suffering. An ordinary lieutenant will eventually write what Bondarev, Astafiev wrote in the end ...

Pierre Bezukhov with his "discovery" in [812] of Platon Karataev, of course, is just a literary hero, but Lev Nikolayevich himself stands behind him, having come into contact with folk

suffering, who went through the Crimean War. In this sense, Sevastopol Tales, and War and Peace, are "lieutenant prose"!

The top leadership is another form of participation in a people's war: direct physical participation, "going on the attack", they were less injured, but the intellectual tension of the war, perhaps, will reveal to them something of the future post-war political justice. .

And as a particular manifestation of this law: grain speculators, forgers of ration cards or ... forgers of marshal's memoirs - these are not the most important participants in the war, and therefore not the best bearers of the justice and wisdom that were discussed.

And this "happy stratum" - who did not go on the attack, but was not responsible for the results of operations (Khrushchev-Brezhnev-Zimyanin-Chernenkov. Mekhlis - from the same breed, once tried to be in charge, answer in the Crimea ... Well didn't like it very much), responsible for bringing packs of Pravda and award forms to the front, she was something natural (for war and unnatural for

204

post-war life) and survived. Stalin, talking about the lost best, saw her suitable friendly columns - members of the military councils with peripheral vision ... But he did not manage to focus his well-known squint, shifting from the side to the aimed look. |

Note. It can be corrected that Secretary General Chernenko did not serve as a political officer in the military councils, but throughout the war he successfully "raised the level" at various party courses. I will object: the difference here is not qualitative, but purely quantitative. Chernenko's position during the war times is also Brezhnev's position, strengthened, brought to the maximum of all tendencies. And if it weren't for that Chernenkov's asthma, there's another question: wouldn't the memoir Marshal Zhukov go to him for advice, in subsequent editions?

HUMAN IS "LIVING PROOF"

Petr Mironovich Masherov. As they recall today: "Next to the sick, infirm and falling asleep at important meetings, members of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the KISS, Masherov looked unforgivably young."

And when Brezhnev, in 1978, very belatedly presented him with the Star of the Hero of Socialist Labor, in front of everyone, he rudely interrupted Masherov during his response speech.

And two years later, Brezhnev sent to Minsk precisely the secretary of the Central Committee of the KISS Zimyanin, knowing full well how badly he treated Masherov.

Today, historians explain that Leonid Brezhnev was alerted by the following fact. One influential American magazine on the eve of the US presidential election conducted a poll among congressmen. The questions were, among other things: which of the foreign leaders could become the president of the United States, who do they see in Brezhnev's place? And very many in the answers coincided: Masherov. Only a few people in TASS knew about the results of this poll.

When in July 1980 Masherov's "Chaika" collided with a truck, I remember very well how many in the country then repeated: "They set it up." But an even greater number of people suddenly realized then (how did intuition develop under the then

205

paucity of information!) that with the death of Pyotr Masherov, the USSR lost hope for a worthy leader to come, passed another fork, passed another point of possible choice.

Pyotr Masherov was a true hero of the Great Patriotic War, on the most, perhaps, difficult and dangerous of its "fronts", he was a partisan in Belarus, but later he crossed out most of the pages relating to his own from the texts that were brought to him for approval. deeds, saying: "No more about me than about any other Hero of Labor."

Belarus, unlike its current teachers from United Europe-2, not only sacrificed its real estate, undermining all available factories, bridges and roads, but also lost every fourth of its people in that war. On September 9, 1942, the mother of Pyotr Mironovich, Daria Petrovna, died at the hands of the Gestapo.

The well-known saying that "suffering enlightens" is about the same thing that was mentioned a little higher: a people's war brings to life a measure of justice and wisdom, which everyone partakes, but - as they participate in suffering and the struggle of the people.

Philanthropy, humanism of Masherov are his most authentic qualities. In his personal diary, his entry is completely artless: "I really love people. I admire people. What is the most beautiful, what is the strongest, what is our wealth, our achievement, is our people. Their souls respond to all things, to all hardships.

Relatives and friends sometimes wondered why he asked ordinary people with whom he constantly met: "How can I help you?" — but he did not ask such questions to his own people and treated them more severely than all the others. Masherov's sister, Olga Mironovna Pronko, confessed: "We were afraid to ask him for what others asked and received. In order to buy a ticket to Moscow at the Minsk airport, and I really wanted to visit Petya after the operation, for the first and only time in my life I had to take advantage of the fact that I was the sister of Petr Mironovich>.

An example from the sphere of music may seem frivolous to some, but not to the youth of the 70s and 80s. What

206

they found themselves in the "empire of lies", they learned not from Solzhenitsyn, but from a simple comparison of youth songs. "Here" is a lie and cynicism in an absolutely unbearable concentration, "there" (in the West) - yes ... in general, it is not known what ... but set to peppy chords. And the language barrier was also a barrier against lies. The only records that were listened to among the youth, sounded at dances, were English-language ensembles and Pesnyary. They joked: "Pensioners" - this is because it seems that any non-English music is "pensioners'". They joked, but they listened (and now, I know, they are older, they collect all the "laser" reissues of Pesnyary, listen to them with tears and vodka) ...

The whole point was that it seemed that "one-sixth under Brezhnev-Chernenko" was an ocean of absolutely uniform lies and cynicism, but they felt that "in Belarus, something is different there." A guy from the Urals, Mulyavin, arrived, and an unprecedented case for the rest of the USSR was "allowed." On the other hand, the Moscow "old farts" from the Union of Composers pushed through a resolution in the Central Committee: youth ensembles at their concerts should intersperse their songs with THEIR songs. Quotas were also attached, royalties, of course. Failure to perform THEIR songs entailed a ban on further concerts, crackdowns ... police. I assure you that this "decree of the Central Committee" was the most famous of all the decisions of the Central Committee for a very large part of our young

population...

So answer me: where could the members of the Union of Composers get such a resolution on the obligatory performance of their songs, in Moscow, at the General Secretary, who recently also got through the point on the obligatory participation of Colonel Brezhnev in the memoirs of Marshal Zhukov, or in Minsk, at Masherov?

I, once conducting a journalistic investigation on the subject of the "Prohibition of 1985", had a chance to find out that, it turns out, "Gorbachev was against it." And then that "Ryzhkov was against it."

Further, which is characteristic, "Ligachev was also against it." And then I was prevented from working, everything was distracted by some kind of half-thought-half-feeling: "Where did I read about this? .." And not immediately, but I remembered where this feeling of "déjà vu" came from ... I read about another investigation — according to the Afghan decision. There, in the same way, it turned out that "the KGB was against",

207

"The Ministry of Defense was against it", "The Foreign Ministry was very against it", "Leonid Ilyich was against it", "The General Staff was completely against it", "our department of the Central Committee was...", "the GRU was strongly against it". And all the veterans of the relevant departments cited quite specific confirmations, analytical notes, and reports. ("Clouds of suspicion" were gathering, it seems, over DOSAAF and over the All-Union Society "Knowledge" - according to them, there were no "television investigations" that "they were against" as well. Here are the ready-made "culprits"). Although, rather, it was not one TV show or an investigative article, but several different ones, made in different years by various TV presenters, writers. And it was some who found out that "the KGB and the Ministry of Defense were against it." And others - that "the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the General Staff" ... But according to the laws of background perception, these private television investigations somehow merged into one. One and the impression of all those years of the country slipping into insanity and non-existence. Perhaps the country had one chance: that the people who saved the country from the most terrible threat in world history, the people who continued to "feel" the country, would try to restore common sense to it. And those who slacked off, slipped without contact even into the people's war - they certainly won't even try ... And they didn't ...

It is possible that Stalin is right that we have lost some, perhaps a critical number of the "best", and "this has also had an effect" in the fact that the vacant seats were occupied by a different category. Yes, Zimyanin did not tolerate Masherov, and for him, as well as for Chernenko, Brezhnev was his own.

Here is even the most particular case of the possible application of his military wisdom: the former partisan Masherov could even think about ... Afghan partisans, who in the most incomprehensible way suddenly fell on ... four times Hero of the Soviet Union, Marshal Brezhnev!

Note. I realized that here, as in the case of Chernenko, they could refute: some of the Lenin Stars of Heroes were not the "Union", but "Labor" ... An inappropriate objection in the case of devaluing both of them ...

Bismarck, who led his state through three wars, in 1878 formulated the philosophy of the newly created empire ("Second Reich"):

208

"We want to achieve a state of affairs in which no one would have the right to say: I exist to bear the burden of state burdens, and no one wants to take care of my fate."

In what ways were Bismarck's difficulties similar to Stalin's in 1945? The same huge expansion of the "zone of responsibility". The "Second Reich" turned out to be twice the size of pre-war Prussia. And many Germans, especially the southern ones: the Swabians, Bavarians, and even the Hessians, considered themselves by no means "united", but captured.

Bismarck, who passed the well-known "anti-socialist laws" through the Reichstag, threw away the Marxists who were trying to fit into the idea of a just state, BUT not the idea itself. Bismarck's idea of life, after a decade of difficult wars, is based not on Marx, but on a certain spirit of Justice, as if coming out of the barracks. Therefore, it is very characteristic who the "Iron Chancellor" referred to in that keynote speech in the Reichstag in 1878:

"Our (Prussian) dynasty has always striven for this goal. Frederick the Great already characterized his mission by saying: I am the king of the poor! Gentlemen, the kings of Prussia have never been kings of the rich. Frederick the Great said: "When I am king, I will be the real king of the poor!"

The image for Bismarck was precisely the commander (and for many, the "soldafon") King Frederick the Great, who stood alone against all of Europe in the Seven Years' War. This is Friedrich's, and then Bismarck's ("..I will be the real king of the beggars!"), probably, is the true view of the general, who understands that the officer is a means, and the soldier is the goal.

Chapter 17 RUSSIA-GERMANY

(Facts and theories, conversations and personal impressions)

It so happened that the author of this book found the 60th anniversary of the Victory in Germany, in Augsburg. That year, 2005, I was connected with Germany by some journalistic topics. In ru

209

The "Capital of the World" block of the magazine "My Moscow" published an article about Berlin, something like road observations, plus "reflections by the roadside", "modernity and history" ... in general, a well-known genre. And the article in Novaya Nedelya magazine (in March 2005) was already much closer to the topics of this book. And although the editor did not omit its title "Adolf Hitler as Trust Manager of CJSC Europe", I was still very grateful to him. It is clear that the name of the Fuhrer, standing (in any context) in the title of an article in a Russian magazine, is somehow annoying. Changed. There were no other cuts, distortions, anything that the author could complain about. Moreover, an interesting "feedback" was formed: the editor kept me informed of calls from various individuals and organizations "regarding the material presented about the war." By the way, even the alternative title of that article, which eventually went to print: "Who will be invited to the 100th anniversary of the Victory?" — could not be called so senseless. As they sometimes put it down: "the result of a concession, a consequence of the pressure of censorship, self-censorship." If the first (my) option is a slogan, a direct reproach to Europe, which transferred its military and economic potential to Hitler and thereby immeasurably complicated the task of its liberation for the Soviet Union, then option No. 2 (editor A. Churkin) is a reflection: how ours and European assessments of the same event, the Second World War, have changed and how they will probably change from anniversary to anniversary.

The starting point of the pamphlet was a certain, if you think about it, paradox: the French did not invite Russia to the 40th anniversary of the opening of the Second Front in 1994 (under Yeltsin) and the invitation - to the 50th anniversary (under Putin)...

In this chapter, I decided to summarize everything passing under the column "personal Russian-German impressions." There are very few of them, my own observations, meetings, conversations or disputes related to the topics of the war or in general to any moments of Russian-German history. And I included almost all of them. Something may seem to you insignificant or weakly related to the theme of the book, but ... Still, I have such a special respect for the "primary fact of history" ...

I remember very much, even from Soviet times, such a case. One researcher worked for a long time in some

210

provincial archives and as a result found a previously unknown letter from V.I. Lenin. Script. Actually, it was a note with the following content:

"Decree. To such and such a comrade, who is going on a responsible mission to Arkhangelsk, to urgently issue a pair of felt boots and a sheepskin coat. Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars. - (Signed) Lenin.

All examinations confirmed: everything is absolutely true, written by Lenin. Personally. The article by the author of the discovery (how he worked, how he "believed and sought") I remember very roughly. But the meaning and spirit of the framing articles in the same issue of the journal and the comments and "responses to the event" in other publications of that period were forever remembered.

Firstly. Good, kind envy towards the happy author of the find: "Consider the dissertation in your pocket!"

Secondly. Best wishes to the entire community. Like: "We must not sit back, not "wipe our pants" in institutes, but work more boldly, more persistently in archives, in the provinces, meet people ... "After all, this is the only way to discover something really new."

Third. General professional joy: "Thanks to our work, the work of historians, the following "Complete collected works of V.I. Lenin" will be released on 2-3 pages (this is a found note with all the necessary comments and notes) more completely.

And indeed, these were not empty compliments to the "author of a serious contribution." After all, in previous editions of the Complete Works of V.I. Lenin" were, if not volumes, then certainly hundreds of pages of letters-notes, against the background of which "ours, dull-booted", looked no paler.

Topics for future dissertations, built around the discovery, looked through without any exaggeration. Or: "New about attention to personnel, about caring for people" (felt boots and sheepskin coats), or: "New about Lenin's attention to the problems of the North" ("the responsible assignment" was to Arkhangelsk). Plus, of course, a monograph with a biography of that "dressed-shod" comrade.

But most importantly, the whole point was in this, earned by honest labor, the right to "new in ...".

Maybe since then my hearing has developed in such a way, some special sensitivity, but only I constantly catch this general

211

tone in any assessment. As if asking: "Well, what's new?". "Did you open something or are you shoveling the old one?>".

What will you answer here? In this book, as relatively new, unfamiliar characters, you recognize, perhaps, only a group of historians, who I brought in to criticize Clausewitz (in the corresponding chapter). And the end-to-end thesis, the slogan: "Adolf Hitler as a trust manager of CJSC Europe" already reflects a reality known to many. The proposed terms "Great War", "the law of the Great War" would be new, but it will still take a huge amount of work, incomparable to the work done, for these semi-intuitive definitions to become recognized terms.

The rest of this book is based on long-known facts, words and deeds of familiar, in general, historical persons. Chamberlain, Hitler, Churchill, Clausewitz, Hugo Grotius... The only fruitful here will be only attempts to compose new combinations of facts. Achieved or not. at least an emotionally new perception - please judge by the following sketch.

COLUMNS OF NUMBERS AND COLUMNS OF TANKS

Here are three rather well-known, but isolated, perceived facts.

Fact No. 1. The Anschluss of Austria (and some of its logistical details). So Churchill:

"The triumphant entry into Vienna was the dream of an Austrian corporal. On the night of Saturday, March 12, the Nazi Party intended to arrange a torchlight procession in honor of the victorious hero...

The reasons for this disruption did not become known soon. The German war machine, having hardly crossed the border, got stuck near Linz. Despite excellent weather and good conditions . most of the tanks were out of action. Defects in heavy motorized artillery were found. The road from Linz to Vienna was jammed with stopped cars. Responsibility for

the blockage, which showed that at this stage of its recovery, the German army was by no means in full readiness, was assigned to the favorite

212

Hitler, General von Reichenau. Hitler himself saw this traffic jam, driving a car through Linz, and became furious. Light tanks randomly entered Vienna on Sunday. Armored vehicles and heavy motorized guns were loaded onto railway platforms and that was the only reason they made it in time for the ceremony. The Fuehrer was furious at the obvious shortcomings of his military machine and attacked his generals, but they did not remain in debt. They reminded him of his unwillingness to listen to Fritsch, to take into account the warning that Germany was not ready for a big conflict (...}”.

Fact No. 2. The balance of forces in 1938 (Czechoslovakia - 469 tanks, 2 million people, Germany - 720 tanks, 2.2 million people) in comparison with the picture of the Anschluss of Austria - with the above picture of the scattering of German scrap metal on road Linz-Vienna. It can be seen that these facts lie on different historical shelves: “This is called the Anschluss of Austria. And that is completely different - in our history it goes under the column "Sudet", "Hitler's threat", "Munich". And it should be on another shelf. How can you combine them?!”

But between these “cases on different shelves” there is a distance of 2-3 weeks! And today, remembering this Munich shyness, we must definitely remember that the German tanks, counted - to this day! - Anglo-French-Czech General Staff officers, historians - these are the very ... hmm ... products that, it turns out, had to be transported to the parade by rail. Driving under its own power on the highway is too heavy a maneuver, inaccessible to them. What about cross country? And in the Sudeten (Giant) mountains? And what about the fortified frontiers on these mountains?.. But even the fact that the Sudetes were turned into the most powerful fortification in Europe is, of course, mentioned, but in special works. Somehow it is forgotten that the Sudetenland is not only a place of residence of the corresponding Germans, but also, in fact, mountains, and that the combination of mountainous relief and fortification gives an effect incomparable with all sorts of “information-promoted” Maginot and Siegfried lines there.. .

So, we mentioned the German tanks of 1938. And what about the opposite statistical column of numbers - Czech tanks? And this...

213

Fact No. 3. Here you have to climb onto a completely different shelf to find out about the European leadership of Czechoslovakia in the export of military equipment in 1938. The same Churchill keeps repeating: “Skoda factories! Skoda factories! More powerful than all British ones!” But besides Skoda, there were also ChKD-Prague factories, whose tank TMNR-5\$ was successfully exported to Iran, Sweden, Switzerland, Romania in the thirties.

And I, as a person who happened to work for eight years in the Foreign Trade of the USSR, can testify: it is simply impossible for these countries (Sweden, Switzerland, for example) to sell something similar to the then German junk. Their own, local, industrialists will conduct such a “PR campaign” that just hold on ... For example, in 1938 the Dutch government decided to buy the British Nietbeg light armored car (or a license for its production). The industrialists of the Van Doorne concern found out about these intentions, which at that time had no analogue in the project... They connected, connected the public, authorities... As a result, the armored car was designed, and then began to be produced on their , to the pre-Dornevsk firm RAE

And since we took this example, we need to follow its path to the end. (Moreover, the “ends” of the then European military equipment are so symptomatically similar.) The M-39 PAE armored car turned out to be an excellent vehicle, but, fortunately, only 25 units managed to produce it. Why “for our happiness”? Yes, that's why! The strength of the Dutch military resistance would not have been affected by the presence of even I ... 2900 tanks, and so ... Fortunately, only 25 were made

tanks, they went to the Germans (intact, of course) and were shot down, as indicated in one report with photographs, already near Leningrad ...

And the German "armored power" of 1938 is yet another historical aberration. All these terrible "tigers", "panthers", "Ferdinands", all this appeared only on Russian fields. In ... and after 1943! And you, gentlemen, the Fuhrer, it turns out, frightened you with the roar of his falling apart self-delok.

If, after this study, your assessment of "Munich" ("Munich", which kept Hitler in power and gave him other tanks,

214

under which other people had to throw themselves with grenades), if at least your emotional perception of that collusion has changed even a little, then the "method" works.

AND NOW ABOUT PERSONAL CONVERSATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS IN GERMANY IN 2005

Maybe these travel essays, a report from the "country of defeated fascism" will seem to someone too bravura, cheerful. It's a pity if somewhere textured "beauties" distracted a little from the more essential – my gathering in every city and town of at least some facts, threads of Russian-German ties.

Why is this gathering of "threads" in a book about the war? That's right, about the war... When you reconsider all these "threads", or rather, a solid fabric that has been developed for centuries... Then, in general, the look at this war becomes even more tragic. You will remember not only that Book of Russian Knights of St. George (there are more than a third of Karl-Ivanychi and Petr-Friedrichovichi), but also the Great Catherine Tsvaitishe (Second). And also the Hessian princess Ella, the most beautiful bride in Europe, who refused the future Kaiser Wilhelm who was wooing, married the Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich, became a widow after the Kalyaev explosion, founded the Marfo-Mariinsky monastery and chose the fate of a Russian great martyr and saint. Remember, and then the question "why?" (about the war) lights up like biblical writing on the wall.

And the notorious topic of "comparing the living standards in the victorious country and the defeated country" becomes completely insignificant against the background of this Question ...

But if we touch on this unfortunate cliché (on the line of "comparison of living standards ..." or with elements of it, we covered almost all German reports), then we can say ... But what about levels ?! Levels are leveling out... In Germany, it's been five years since the economic crisis, in our country it's the other way around. The gap, if we are talking about "expressed in numbers", is objectively shrinking ...

But those of our journalists who for thirty years "strangled themselves" for breaking out "to a foreign country in the FRG" and writing there dramatic "essays on the unemployed" ... and those people who

215

During "perestroika" they came up with those same jokes about our veteran ("I shouldn't have won - I would have drunk Bavarian beer now") - these are all the nicest people ...

Moreover. I think that they are in fact, physically, the same people. Like this one me a guess.

Chapter 18

FIGHTING AGAINST HITLER. AND ETERNAL POP

Enormous efforts of European and American propaganda, from the latest newspaper to Hollywood, and a huge number of books were supposedly aimed at fighting our enemy, Hitler, that is. I

now about the struggle aimed at establishing the postulates in the world consciousness:

"Hitler is a mystic, a satanist, an occultist. The NSDAP is a God-fighting, anti-Christian party. The Third Reich is generally a mystical order. Ahnenerbe, Tibet, Ple, Shambhala, etc.>".

But there are suspicions that the absolutization of these postulates can bring real harm to the country that defeated the Third Reich - Russia.

To begin with, a long historical digression is required.

In Europe at the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries, after all the victories of the great scientific revolution, a significant part of the French elite suddenly began to incline to the idea that "Louis the Fourteenth is still in some way God." After Pascal and Descartes, in the time of Newton and Leibniz, the French aristocrats, who were traditionally friends and patrons of scientists, suddenly wanted to become like the ancient Egyptian peasants who prayed to their pharaohs (the closest historical analogue).

So, historians with knowledge of psychology have found the origins of this unconditional phenomenon in ... defeated, broken France.

The spirit, the way of thinking of the French aristocrat was formed in the estate monarchy and was vitally connected with the whole universe

216

various privileges, "feudal-knightly habits". They "fronted" for their own "habits" for their preservation. And a complete defeat, "breaking through the knee", seriously threatened class honor, morality and even the mental health of an aristocrat. So the following thought slowly condensed: "It's possible to humiliate yourself in front of Ludovik, it's not shameful, because it's ... that-s... in some way - God>."

Let's go back to the 20th century. And what was left for two hundred and fifty million Europeans to do? (250,000,000 is the human potential of the Third Reich. Hitler especially loved and very often repeated this, in general, the correctly calculated number of his subjects.) What should the 250 million respectable Christians liberated by the Red Army, the Soviet Union do? Moreover, when did a whole set of economic claims against the former liberator mature?

That's right, the key to self-rehabilitation is the maximum (multiplying the power of fascism. Multiplying it also by the demonic factor. This allows:

1) reduce the measure of responsibility for capitulation and for the five- (or six-) year maintenance of the Nazi machine: "Hitler? He was strong, the devil! Didn't cope";

2) get a "blank slate", carte blanche for modern political maneuvers. The clearest example is the 1999 attack on Yugoslavia. The "United Europe"-2 that implemented it geographically, ethnically, physically repeated the United Europe-1, except that the capital moved from Berlin to Brussels. And even concern for the interests of a minority (Kosovo Albanians) surprisingly resembled Adolf's touching concern for the Sudeten Germans.

And European politicians to the possible Serbian accusation against the United Europe-2 can answer something like this:

"And that time, in [94[th], it was not us who attacked. Not Europe. That is, in the physiological sense, they were, of course, yes, our fathers and grandfathers. But then Satan himself was at the head. Beelzebub, Asmodeus... and Lucifer. From him and all the demand. And now our bombing and trampling of your Yugoslav state sovereignty is based on very, very different ideals. On straight ideal ideals.

217

So what do we get from this campaign to demonize the Fuhrer?

An example of state management of the RK campaign was given in due time by our Supreme Commander-in-Chief. In 1941-1944, when European-backed Germans burned and killed on the territory of the Soviet Union, the well-known slogans of our propaganda were: "Kill the German!", "Death to the fascist invaders!". And in 1945, exactly on the eve of the first meeting of our troops with the civilian population [of Germany, I.V. Stalin came out with a special, famous article. "Comrade Ehrenburg is mistaken. Hitlers come and go, but the German people remain." The Nazis for us, in fact, have already ceased to be "occupiers" ("occupy" is translated "occupy"), and then we had to liberate Europe from ... its First Uniter ...

Generally speaking, literature about the "mystical, satanic Reich" is a sea-ocean. The only difference is that the ocean, the level of the ocean is stable, even accepted as a known reference point. And the literature about the "Tula-Shambala Nazis" is growing almost weekly. The logic is this:

"Secrets of the Reich, SS, Himmler-Bormann" - a commodity? - Yes!

"Occultism, mysticism, spiritualists, magicians" - a commodity? - Still would!

So ... "SS magicians, the mysticism of the Third Reich" will be a super commodity!

For all this pop, an old, enviable reference point, an example of hitting the bestsellers, was, of course, the book published in 1960 by Louis Povel and Jacques Bergier "The Morning of the Magicians". With their light hand, Povel-Bergier, even the learned geopolitician Karl Haushofer, who really influenced Hitler during his imprisonment in the Landsberg fortress (through Hess), is appointed to the magician something like ... "a wizard from the country Oz." And the Haushofer influence exerted is, accordingly, a magical influence. They, Povel-Bergier, also gave a formula, a definition-explanation of Hitler's strength: "Rene [Guenon plus tank divisions." Well, Rene Guenon is an "authoritative magician", an occult brand, and the slogan itself, in general, came out lucid and biting, similar to the advertising slogan "Just add water!"

218

So, the vein was opened. And then, happily and... it seems, it was not by chance that the financial attractiveness of such writings and a certain off-screen political order were combined: to take Adolf, Himmler, Rosenberg and others "out of the brackets" of European politics, to position them as "half-educated magicians" (remember such a song?

As a navigator in this "magical" ocean, we will involve Dmitry Zhukov, the author of the excellent study "Occultism in the Third Reich." Although, frankly, the work he faced in some way ... cesspool. What is it like to re-read dozens of graphomaniacs copying each other in circles: the Templars — the Grail — the Cathars — the riddle of the pyramids — Loch Ness — Shambhala — Thule (further with all the stops)...

Well, let's use the results of Zhukov's work.

In the "Morning of the Magi", it turns out that the following is also written:

"February 23 [1957] in Bohemia, a diver was looking for the body of a student who had drowned in Devil's Lake. He (the diver) swam to the surface with a face pale with horror, unable to utter a word. When the gift of speech returned to him, he reported that he saw under the cold heavy waters of the lake a ghostly line of German soldiers in uniform, a convoy of harnessed carts.

As the youth would say: "Oh! Underwater zombies are cool!"

Further, D.Kh. Brennan, The Black Magic of Adolf Hitler.

Chapter Titles: Black Initiate, Roots of Evil, Sinister Symbol, Sacrifice Satan."

"..Hitler decided on a treaty. He decided to ask Satan for help, to ask for a miracle of such power that could change external physical conditions ... We studied his (Hitler's) career - this is the career of a magician. In short, the way Hitler thought and acted is exactly how Satanists live, think and act... The witches carried out special actions to prevent Hitler from landing after the fall of France..."

Goodrick-Clark, The Occult Roots of Nazism. Jean Robin, Hitler the Dragon's Chosen. It is here that Haushofer is appointed as a magician, a teacher. So to speak - "head magician."

219

Reasons? Haushofer traveled to Japan on instructions from the Bavarian General Staff, and Tibet is nearby! He must have stopped by!.. But one who has been to Tibet is a magician with no options!..

More... Trevor Ravenscroft, the book "The Spear of Destiny" (the spear of the Roman warrior Longinus, this is from the same nomenclature series as the Grail). Here Hitler joins the ranks of the famous: Aleister Crowley (Satanist), Rudolf Steiner and... Helena Blavatsky.

Yes, yes, and our compatriot (by the way, Count Witte's cousin) Helena Blavatsky, the founder of Theosophy, is a first-rate brand in the occult market. More often than others in the twentieth century, she used the swastika sign in books and letters. It is believed that it was she, "her swastika" who influenced Adolf when choosing a "label" for "his company".

I repeat once again: the mention of individual books is from the "epoch of the initial accumulation of magical capital." When the names of the authors were still distinguishable. This was followed by a real wave, hundreds of books and pamphlets, voices became indistinguishable, and ... the magician Hitler became a fact of public consciousness.

And now Yuri Vorobyevsky is releasing "Ahnenerbe - the occult sword of the Reich."

N. Nepomniachtchi: "Secrets of the Occult Reich". S. Zubkov: "The Occult Magic of the Third Reich". And a certain Anton Pervushin - "Occult secrets of the NKVD and the SS." Here is a good example of a book where everything is clear already from the title. However, Dmitry Zhukov (professional duty!) plunges into this historical-mystical graphomania, to "... the secrets of the Merovingian family, the Templars and the Dominicans, the secret gift of some Odoacer, well, the famous Satanist Aleister Crowley" (whose entire connection with fascism was that he was thrown out of Italy in 1923 by order of Mussolini).

I would still single out these Pervushin "Occult Secrets of the NKVD and SS" from the general commercial stream. The example is typical. Say, magic, "the boundaries of the real, material world are so unsteady, conditional...", and now the NKVD falls into the same niche, into the same "segment" with the SS. And there, you see, there will appear ... "the magic of the Red Army and the Wehrmacht" ...

That's a good topic for a hypothetical (yet) press conference. Agenda items:

220

1. Who benefits from the positioning of Hitler as a kind of Harry Potter (only enraged and falling into "denial") today?

2. About the primary sources used for this positioning. |

It seems that at the everyday level, attaching additional negative characteristics to the enemy is, as it were, a kind of ... contribution to the "propaganda fight against the common enemy." This premise is not entirely correct. And even completely wrong, if applied without taking into account the historical phase, the period of application: in the "Combat List", before the attack? Or during the period of post-war discussions, when one deliberately false accusation can undermine the credibility of ten real ones?

But here it is better to start from point 2. About primary sources.

It is clear that today books about the "Occult Secrets of the NKVD and SS" are being sold by people who have never crossed the threshold of archives in their lives, and in principle do not even know where these archives are located in their countries. Books multiply by cell division, like bacteria in rancid broth, but... the question of the original source remains relevant for a serious researcher. Let's continue, relying on the work of Dmitry Zhukov.

VETERAN OF THE SWISS FRONT OF THE SECOND WORLD

"Mobilization" by Hermann Rauschning is a vivid example of the operation of the laws of propaganda warfare. So. Hermann Rauschning was born in 1887 in Thorn. Adventurer by nature. His military career almost fell apart: by 1918 he was only a lieutenant. After the war, he settled in Danzig, heading the German Cultural Society. In 1932, he joined the Nazis, for a short time he became the chairman of the Danzig Senate, in which capacity he had an audience with Hitler 4 (four) times. Quarreled with Gauleiter Forster, expelled from the SS, NSDAP, emigrated to Switzerland.

In the summer of 1939, in dire need of money, Rauschning accepted an offer from the anti-fascist activist Imre Reves to write in record time, disguised as a memoir, a propaganda book exposing Nazism. The Jewish writer Reves at that time headed the anti-German propaganda

221

in the world press, in contact with Churchill and the war party in London. Possessing almost unlimited funds, Reves provided a large staff of his employees, translators, to help Rauschning. As a result, almost instantly (by book publishing standards) a book was published "Hitler told me. Confidential reports of the Fuhrer about his plans to conquer the whole world" (1939).

The book was immediately published in 20 countries in huge circulation. In it, for the first time, it was mentioned that the Nazis had a certain "secret teaching, developed in certain circles of a very small elite." To which (elite) Rauschning himself must have been assigned. And those 4 (four) of his audience with the Fuhrer, respectively, were turned into "hundreds of frank conversations."

Rauschning's further "discography": "Revolution of Nihilism" (1939), "Voice of Destruction" (1940), "Beast from the Abyss" (1940), "Time of Frenzy" (1946).

Chapter 4 of his first "hit" in 1939 was called "Anti-Christian" - and it became the source of thousands of "research" books and pamphlets, feeding the Pervushins and Vorobyevskys to this day.

Chapter "Black and White Magic": "Hitler gave himself up to the forces that draw him along ... He has long surrendered to the power of witchcraft, which, not without reason and not at all in a figurative sense, can be called demonic magic."

The Fuhrer and Freemasons: "They form something like an elite of the clergy ... fence themselves off from people with the help of symbols and rituals. Hierarchical structure and upbringing with symbols, apart from reason, through the fertilization of fantasy, magical influence ... and this I take over from them."

He is also a communist: "There are more similarities between us and the Bolsheviks than differences. First of all, a true revolutionary spirit, free from the intrigues of any shabby social democracy..."

To me (Rauschning Reves) all this reminds me a little of the scene from Dead Souls, where provincial officials, stupefied with boredom, are interrogating the "witness Nozdryov":

"What, maybe Chichikov and... Napoleon?!"

— Napoleon. Napoleon. Without any doubt - Napoleon! .. "

222

Even many years later, in the famous film by Mikhail Romm "Ordinary Fascism", it turns out that Rauschning's phrases are reproduced:

"I," said Hitler, "liberate people from burdensome limitations of the mind, dirty and degrading self-poisoning by chimeras called conscience and morality."

However, there is one important difference between Rauschning's discoveries and Nozdrev's: at that time there was a war. And Reves fulfilled (and one might say brilliantly fulfilled) his duty as a military publicist!

But, probably, even the most talented publicists need the state redirection of their excitement and efforts (I almost made a reservation - "barking"). So Stalin in 1945 "corrected" Ehrenburg, but there was practically no one to correct Mikhail Romm in the 1960s.

So, during the war, Reves worked in an important area. And Pervushina's and others shuffling Reves' military campaign materials today, as a result, they are kneading the entire theme of the Second World War into a ball of frivolous pop music. And what remains serious after this operation? What could be more serious than World War II, Munich, Yalta? And here you are (place cleared): minority rights, Strasbourg European gatherings, Helsinki groups...

From the point of view of the laws of the media and PR, these are all competing topics in the struggle for print space, for airtime.

And anyone trying to draw public attention to the topic of Europe's real, geopolitical responsibility will stumble upon the same, the "pop" perception of the war.

What kind of war? Is this where Private Ryan was rescued and Schindler rode around the camps with his List?.. But these films are still all right. The truth about the "Great War" also emerges there. But the transformation of the Second World War into a competition of magicians, table-turners - this is a real undermining.

Even the propaganda canard with equating the Battle of El Alamein with the Battle of Stalingrad and, as they say, is "available for processing." With the help of numbers and four arithmetic operations on them, you can restore the truth. But it will be much more difficult to deal with this global dispersion.

223

eating historical attention, memory, washing out the very idea of war. "Magic", "Occult Services" - this is a familiar page on the last pages of today's advertising newspapers. The permanent entry of the Fuhrer, the NSDAP, the SS there would be the most negative outcome, the complete loss of the RK campaign.

Such an example. If the director of some bank went crazy, turned into clowns, fled to Brazil, which of the clients will suffer more? Probably in proportion to contributions.

And... if Hitler suddenly turns out to be Harry Potter today, whose history will suffer more: Denmark, with its one and a half hour military resistance in 1940 and 36 dead, OR...

SWASTIKA - CROSS

The next important topic is Fascism and Religion. And here overlaps are just as harmful. "Let's show [Hitler, if it didn't work out as a Satanist, then then by Satan himself! An enemy of Christianity." But Hitler was a politician, a European politician! As the saying goes: "They don't beat the wolf for that..." The Fuhrer can rather be accused of religious indifference, of a purely utilitarian attitude towards religion. Need to strengthen the loyalty of nearby employees? And [Hitler agrees to be the godfather of their children.

Raise the birth rate in the Reich? And Hitler announces: "I personally will be the godfather of the tenth child of every German mother!" And he was an invariable diligent participant in the sacrament of Baptism. Or, let's say, it is necessary to try to split the population of the Soviet Union - and in the occupied territories it was opened: in the regions of the RSFSR - 2150 churches, in Belarus - 600 churches, in Ukraine - 5400.

Politician Hitler most of all feared a violation of the unity of the German nation. He overcame the threat of disunity on property, social grounds by the most active political measures (a blow to the communists, the elimination of unemployment, a system of restrictions on big capital - these measures of his, of course, are the subject of separate books, his social decisions, ideas so far

224

time in circulation). But Hitler tried to eliminate the threat of religious intra-German conflicts at the very bud with an extremely restrained, cautious, "equidistant" policy.

In Mein Kampf, he writes that the initiators of religious strife: "... are much worse enemies of the people, even than internationally minded communists... Let everyone remain with their faith, but let everyone consider it their first duty to fight against those who undermine the faith of another. Only with mutual compliance, only with equal tolerance can the present state of affairs be corrected and ensure that in the future the nation really becomes united and great>.

Well, let's say this ("Mein Kampf") - so far the intentions, personal convictions of Hitler. Before turning to his real politics after 1933, let us briefly mention the religious ideas of his environment.

Goebbels. Born into a Catholic family, he dreamed of the priesthood. Both in his autobiographical novel "Michael" and in his diary, he repeated: "Our struggle is in the deepest sense the struggle between the teachings of Christ and Marx."

Rosenberg. His book "The Myth of the 20th Century" received a detailed review even from our Sergei Bulgakov, who noted its "literary brilliance and sharpness." Rosenberg rejects the Old Testament and the Apostle Paul.

We can also mention the rather boring bickering accusing Rosenberg of "neopaganism", "Wotanism" and justifying the fact that "Wotanism was already described as a dead religion". His main, Rozenberg, political point is: "The National Socialist movement does not need religious dogma either in defense of religion or in the fight against it ... my ideological recognition is considered only as my personal ..."

These excerpts may recall one well-known and, in my opinion, partly mocking religious statement of the all-German idol, military genius, King Frederick the Great: "In my kingdom, everyone is saved as he wants!" (Meaning "salvation of the soul", belonging to any religion.)

225

Himmler. Also from a Catholic family, plus his father was the tutor of the Crown Prince Tenrich of Bavaria. (Prince Heinrich, by the way, was also the godfather of the future Reichsfuehrer SS.)

The text of the SS oath was downloaded: "... and God help me." He instructed the professorial staff of the SS officer schools: "I categorically forbid you to show not only tactlessness, but even inattention to representatives of all confessions without exception ... If I demand from the SS men that they be believers ... then I demand this quite meaningful and firm. People who do not recognize a higher being or predestination, I will not tolerate in my environment. Any attack on Christ as a person is absolutely unacceptable."

To this person, Christ, they, the Nazis, willingly "issued" the most valuable document in the Reich: "Certificate of non-Jewish origin". "Evidence of Aryan"...

Only Bormann can be considered a more or less convinced fighter against Christian denominations. In the questionnaire of a Bundestag deputy in 1933, he called himself a Protestant, but already in 1936 he officially announced his withdrawal, together with his wife, from the list of parishioners. The underlying causes of this change

yet unknown to the riks — except, of course, the above-mentioned commercial occult writers (everything is clear there: a flying saucer — Tibet — an appeal — a blood oath

overshmanize Christians...). The set of specific Bormann's actions gives rise to a strange feeling: "What is it all about?" All entirely some sent out recommendations. And this despite the fact that Reichsleiter Bormann among his direct subordinates, the Gauleiters, had at least four devout Catholics. There were also Protestants. The Gauleiter of Swabia, Karl Weil, openly declared that he "throws Bormann's dispatches into the fireplace without reading them." The Gauleiter of Silesia, Joseph Wagner, treated Bormann much worse and refused to "carry out any anti-Christian actions on the territory of his Gau." Gauleiter of Southern Hannover-Braunschweig, Bernhard Rust, "sent" Bormann, however, having previously enlisted the support of Goering-Goebbels. But what sort of "anti-Christian actions" by Bormann were we talking about? That,

226

what Rust then thwarted was ... "a proposal to close the faculties of theology at the universities of Germany." And on June 9, 1941, Bormann sent out, as historians write, "the infamous circular." The document stated "about the incompatibility of Nazism and religion, about the fact that the ideology of the party is based on a scientific basis, about the need to overcome "religious particularism".

Numerous appeals to Hitler with protests followed. The Fuhrer was indignant and ordered the circular to be withdrawn. Bormann backpedaled, declaring that he was not the author of the text, but an assistant who had already been punished was sent to the front. In general, well, Reichsleiter Bormann does not live up to his iron film image performed by Yuri Vizbor... that he left the church. Here Bormann nevertheless arranged the matter in such a way that Hitler rudely expelled Wagner from the congress of party leaders. But other participants in the congress commented with contempt that it was Bormann who "buzzed the Führer's ears... and even during the most difficult period of the war... and the Fuhrer's nerves simply could not stand it." Then Bormann also achieved the return of Wagner to the highest party court of the NSDAP, "who ... completely sided with the persecuted Catholic Wagner. Just as futile were Bormann's attempts to abolish the service of chaplains in the Wehrmacht.

CROSS - SWASTIKA

On March 23, 1933, Hitler called Christian churches "an important element in preserving the soul of the German people." In April, at a secret session of the Consistory, Pope Pius XG approved

Hitler's struggle against Bolshevism. In June, a joint pastoral message from all German bishops called for cooperation with the new regime.

On June 20, 1933, a German concordat was signed with the Vatican. Vice-Chancellor von Papen, who signed it for Germany, recalls Mussolini's words: "This concordat will for the first time strengthen confidence in your government abroad." And then von Papen: "Hitler for

227

revealed to his radical colleagues that his plans for perestroika could only be carried out in an atmosphere of religious tolerance..."

The Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church in the Reich, Michael von Faulhaber, reported to the Pope about ... perestroika in Germany and brought approval and support from there. Von Faulhaber: "Germany extended its hand to the papacy, the greatest moral force in world history... this is truly a great and good gesture, raising the authority of Germany in the West, in the East, all over the world to a new level. We sincerely, from the bottom of our hearts, wish: God bless our Reichskaniler, for our people need him.

His own Christmas sermon in 1933: "The church point of view does not contain any contradictions to racial studies and racial culture. There are no contradictions to the desire to preserve the national characteristics of the people, to maintain its purity and authenticity, to favor the revival of the national spirit on the basis of blood ties."

When in 1936 the Swiss leaders called on their flock to pray for the death of Hitler, Cardinal von Faulhaber accused them of departing from Christianity and said: "Catholics, we will now all pray together for the life of the Fuhrer."

Well, there is another well-known page of cooperation — the rescue, the flight of hundreds of Nazis with the help of church channels, connections, documents.

Even before the NSDAP came to power, Protestants tried to establish contacts with it. In 1932, the pro-Nazi German Christian Movement was created. In 1933, an 800,000-strong evangelical youth organization officially joined the Hitler Youth.

The charter of the new Imperial Church was developed, which was supposed to unify the entire Protestant part of the Reich. (The fact that this was not done is, by the way, another example of what Speer in his testimonies called "the heterogeneity, the feudal conglomeration of the Reich".)

Of course, it is necessary to mention the opposition of some Protestants to the Nazi regime. On September 21, 1933, the Emergency Pastors' Union, or Confessional

228

church. By the beginning of 1934, 7,000 priests had joined it. They were very bold, but also very selective in their criticism of Nazi policies. They condemned the persecution of the Jews, publicly prayed for them, but also supported Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nations. Many of these courageous people were repressed.

And one more, very characteristic example of the Nazi religious policy. In the occupied Crimea lived Karaites who professed Judaism. (By the way, Marshal Yakubovsky and the poet Selvinsky were Karaites.) SS experts carefully studied historical documents, anthropometric data of Karaite prisoners of war and confirmed that the Karaites belong to the Turkic group... The result was not only no repressions, but was even discovered (in Evpatoria) a Jewish temple for the Karaites. So the Crimean land, rich in diversity, gave such a unique picture in world history: "The Waffen-SS solemnly open ... a synagogue!"

For the sake of completeness, it would be necessary to mention dozens of "self-made theories" like "Ariachristianity", which tried to fit Christianity under all sorts of "Nordic", "Aryan" points. All of them are beautifully and fascinatingly (as far as the boredom of the original material allows) analyzed in the book by Dmitry Zhukov.

The only remark is a half-objection to Zhukov. Having excellently explored the genesis of the "occult Reich" nonsense, having described their source, Rauschning's books, he, Zhukov, also awards the book of Henry Picker "Hitler's Table Talk" with the same epithet "doubtful". Although he (Zhukov) himself recognizes and mentions the facts of the enormous, fundamental difference between these books. Henry Picker indeed from March 1942 took shorthand of Hitler, indeed he received for the notes of his predecessor, Heinrich Greim. And Zhukov's distrust is caused only by the fact that Picker was in British captivity and the general "confusion of Hitler's statements".

But after all, this is straightforwardness - just the property of directed falsifications. And so - the whole situation "in Hitler's refectory", rare replicas of the environment and, most importantly, the general style of Hitler's monologues are amazingly reliable and stylistically coincide with fragments from Speer's notes (indirect confirmation!). And the combination of confusion, itself

229

contentment and paranoid obstinacy of Hitler on some of the most diverse points like:

"his front-line, trench experience in the First World War",

"vegetarianism",

"Jews" (yes, in that sequence in terms of frequency of mention!) - this is precisely the facsimile accuracy of the Fuhrer's appearance and manner recorded in the book, who by 1942 had achieved that even his devoted listeners exchanged glances at the table at the next the coming down of the Adolf Plate...

However, all this, of course, is the front of the work of textologists and psychologists. We have come to another conclusion.

There was not and is not an impassable gulf between Hitler's religious policy and modern politically correct standards.

Belarusian President Lukashenko politically incorrect? Are the attempts of the Russian authorities to single out four historically rooted religions here, in Russia, and restrict all kinds of sectarians and Scientologists also not politically correct? Let it be!

However, then you, the bodies issuing this "certificate of political correctness", must recognize one of the two. Or:

1) Politically correct, respecting freedom of conscience were Adolf and K.

Or:

2) Political correctness is just a kind of pseudo-scientific synonym for a concept that simply means political obedience to Washington and Brussels.

AND ABOUT "SCIENTIFIC-SHAMBALA" POP, FINALLY

This tricky task of "turning Hitler into Harry Potter" is very close to the theme of the film "UFO of the Third Reich", shown on the Rossiya TV channel on September 2, 2006. The author of the film is Vitaly Pravdivtsev, Goldmedium company.

The recipe is about the same. "Let the theme of fascism of the twentieth century be a whole sea. So let's dissolve it in the ocean of pop!" All the same UFOs, time travel, Ahnenerbe Secret Society, Tibet, Shambhala, Thule country, Bermuda

230

Sky Triangle, Antarctica (further with all stops). Generous scatterings of photographs of someone's drawings (and vice versa, someone's drawings from memory from photographs they once saw). In general, Hitler had flying saucers, partly invisible to the enemy. Even the brands are indicated: "Vril", "Belonso" (the latter seemed to be more powerful). Their combat purpose? But really? After all, to hoist a serious bomb load on these fragile and very thin creatures made of unknown metals is, of course, not even the fantasy of "scientific pop artists" for this. Then let there be observers! Probably, "from the saucers" you can see something at the enemy, which you can't see from all aircraft ("frames" of the Focke-Wulf-189).

The saucer engines were both "ordinary" and ... "techno-magical" Schauburger. The technologies of these engines were

smuggled out - of course! — "Ahnenerbers" from ... where else - from Tibet! (On camels.) And, of course, Hitler's personal fate - here the closure

The "scientific-documentary" film of the Russian TV channel with the above-mentioned mystical pop corpus of compositions is absolutely complete. Hitler, it turns out, nevertheless outwitted the allies - in general, Stalin chased the Smershevites after his corpse. The Fuhrer sailed on submarines, and then flew on saucers with "techno-magic engines" to Antarctica. There, in 1947, he attacked the American fleet... In the same place, in Antarctica, there is a point of special "worm passages" to the star Vega...

The only thing I fear is that those who have not seen this film will suspect that the author of this book deliberately chose some kind of children's program as the subject of disclosures and now he is making fun of filmmakers, and even ... "generalizes".

No, I assure you, the film is absolutely serious, popular science. Dozens of "experts" were involved in the creation. Captain | rank Viktor Berezhnoy testifies: "Yes, in the region of the South Islands [Ggorgia in 1979, we observed something ... very anomalous."

Doctor of Sciences (albeit, economics) Vladimir Vasiliev (Institute of the USA and Canada) reported on American control stations at both poles, in Antarctica and Alaska, that same worm-and-worm crossing, along which, like on an escalator: bang! — and you are already on the star Vega.

231

In principle, of course, this is a worldwide trend: more and more people are accustomed to accept their various, class-individual doses of information about science, art - only in a pop-dissolved, sensationally flavored, glamorous-caramelized form.. .

BETWEEN "MISSION" AND "MARKET"

Thoughtful analysts, even in the field of Big Science, have noted one important trend of recent decades.

Several of my conversations with the Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute of Atmospheric Physics of the Russian Academy of Sciences [Georgy Sergeevich Golitsyn, the leading geophysicist of the world (published in Nezavisimaya Gazeta, NG-Nauka), from purely geophysical problems, they moved precisely to this problem of global retargeting Sciences. Previously, science was looking for truth, today it serves the information needs of society. It seems to be "putting something at the service of society" is a "holy cause", in any case, it is generally useful. (This, in fact, is the ideology of the reform of our RAS, which is taking place these very days.) But here, if you think about it, a subtle

difference. They believed that society itself would better order science what and where to look for, discover, invent. Or, in another variation, already familiar to us: "The invisible Hand of the Market will put everything in its place", one scientist will be given an order, others - down ... I only wonder: where, when, which market could order Newton to discover his laws or X-ray of its rays? Is such an order-attire possible at all: "Open to me, brother ... what is not there."

History testifies: real science, serving the truth, served society better. And if, as, in general, many philosophers and economists admit, the "needs of society" have long been the object of a directed advertising strategy, manipulation, inspiration, then, accordingly, with their most important part - "information needs" — things are no better.

And now, even if Big Science is put on the service of information needs, then what can we say about its subdivisions that stand on the verge of science and "on

232

uchpopa"? Or let's get closer to our topic: what will happen to the science of history? It seems to be (admittedly) "historical shelves" in bookstores "bursting with goods." This product sells well - the "need of society" is calculated correctly by the publishers. But what about these needs? When (with current trends) even Herodotus and Tacitus cannot be sold without an announcement: "Sensation!" "New revelations!" - and something about the sexual orientation of the authors.

And ... now - strictly on the topic of the book: the trick is that this universal, worldwide trend of "opposing history" is by no means equally harmful worldwide. And if Vitaly Pravdivtsev, the author of the science-pop film, can dismiss the accusations: "Why?! Everyone is filming about Hitler, Tibet, Loch Ness - here I am! .."- then we have the right to apply the same postulate here as to the satanic-magic pop music a few pages ago, only slightly corrected:

"For Denmark, which fought in World War II for an hour and a half and lost 36 people, Pipler, who flew to Antarctica on a flying saucer, today means NOT THE SAME THING as for Russia!"

That's why I have questions for the channel:

— And the power of the "Schauberger techno-magical engine" installed on the Vrill flying saucers is not measured in "horse-magic powers"?

- And you, dear TV channel, the Goldmedium company ... noticed that your film -
is a contribution to:

1) making sense of the Second World War and Russian and world history in general;

2) the aestheticization of fascism.

About the latter (the danger of the aestheticization of fascism) interestingly wrote (there is it on the sites) science fiction writer Nick Perumov. Indeed, saucers, interplanetary ships, cosmodromes - and all with swastikas, and around very recognizable slender figures in leather raincoats, caps with high crowns and stacks - all this just begs for children's albums and youthful wall posters.

The only paradox is that today such a "swastika sci-fi pop" in Germany would not even be allowed close to the screens...

233

Chapter 19 SO WHAT SHOULD WE DO WITH THIS VICTORY?

First of all, our victory in World War II (as well as defeat in the Cold War), the continuity of the United Europe (Berlin and Brussels) - all this should be included, firmly built into a single historical process, already indelibly inscribed in the true, and not politically correct - a convenient picture of the twentieth century. For this reason, these most important examples were collected in this book: the battle of Mers el-Kebira, Munich, the pre-emptive captures of Memel, Iceland, the Baltic states, the facts of the real commercially conditioned functioning of the United (Hitler) Europe, "Czech armored legs and arm Hitler"... to outline the real outline of the "Great War" of the twentieth century. And not the War of the Right, but with some corrections, clarifications, as in the memorable "tables of Bradis". That is, everything was correct, with the exception of a certain set of events from a distant closet, to each of which a note was pinned: "This does not count", "We were joking", "We accidentally did this", "And this ... did you remember?!"

The law of the "Great War" should serve to explain the hard indigestible facts not only of that war, but also of the subsequent period. Any country that has repelled deadly aggression is obliged to take measures against possible repeated attempts. The Soviet Union, as has been said many times, was at war not only with Germany, but also with Europe. That is why Stalin was obliged to take measures: to cut off not only from Germany—East Germany, but also from Europe—Eastern Europe. Roosevelt and Churchill, who fought closely with the Great War, recognized this right of the Soviet Union. And it is very revealing: they recognized this right of the USSR not at the height of the war, in Tehran! And in Yalta, a few weeks before it, the war, the end, AFTER the USSR once again (and last!) In the European theater of operations, during the Ardennes crisis saved them with its throw to the Oder.

This right of the USSR to material, territorial guarantees against a repetition of aggression had
its consequence

234

and the responsibility is the arrangement of the buffer area. Was the task hopeless? In principle, the states of this region were well aware of the idea of their "functional" existence — they performed the role of a "cordon sanitaire" against the USSR in the 1920s and 1930s more or less skillfully. In Hitler's United Europe they were also quite diligent.

Resources? After all, the sanitary cordon service to these limitrophe countries (now no longer against, but in the interests of the USSR), of course, must be paid for.

But that period was just that unique: almost every month colonies fell away from the Western bloc, and in the USSR, as with a wave of a magic wand, either a "second Baku" (oil Volga region) or "Siberian pantries" were opened. The victories of the communists in China and Indonesia were considered almost decisive in the geopolitical duel.

Only a weak experience of economic and social organization was against us (and in comparison, let's say, with the German experience in the Baltics, one might say, its complete absence, experience). And, of course, the same "lack of theory". Although, if you think about it, we also had a solid temporary head start, a margin of trust. These are the years of restoration, removal of rubble (and in the direct, including, sense of the word). Simple and real work. Figuratively speaking: even very narrow-minded managers will be able to set up chains of people passing bricks.

Again, and from any responsibility for this destruction (and the war), the communists were absolutely farthest away. And objectively, "in truth", it is further than anyone else, and, what is very important, in the public consciousness, it is also further than the majority of parties and groups. In other words, when the surviving world was faced with the gigantic question: "How did this happen? (fascism)" — everyone, from lawyers and philosophers to writers and film directors, made their own lists of those guilty and involved in their works. And if all these lists are brought together into one final list, the communists rightly turn out to be the last ones there ... Even the well-known "private definition" of the Nuremberg Tribunal against the philosopher Nietzsche worked in this direction - after all

The "forerunner of fascism" (this is Nietzsche, according to the official judgment of Nuremberg) was at the same time the most famous and consistent enemy of the "communist project".

235

In general, that was the era "before the Rezuns", and to equate, for example, the gigantic, geopolitical fact of Munich with some note in the margins of Trotsky's Mexican diary: ".. and Stalin also probably wanted to ..." - this has never crossed his mind, even Bukovsky's.

But when the rubble on both sides of the "Iron Curtain" was raked and it was necessary to move on, it was here that the absence of a theory (real, working), which worried Stalin so much, began to be gradually realized ... BUT ... the next generations of the Kremlin, it seems, and did not really understand what it was about. ("Slogans, banners were drawn and hung up by the first/seventh day, which means that "the point on ideological work can be considered closed.")

And the question "how this vacuum was filled" is directly related to the topics mentioned above. Again, a typical example of the backwardness of our "ideologists".

"ASYMMETRIC RESPONSES DURING THE COLD WAR"

Through the efforts of our scientists, industrialists, military theorists, the concept of "asymmetric response" has long been established and therefore does not require explanation. There are well-known examples when, during the period of the "arms race", in response to the billion-dollar threats from the United States, our scientists offered an almost penny answer in a different plane of confrontation, which, however, completely neutralized the threat ... But these are precisely our "ideologists", in my opinion, they missed the biting "asymmetric response" in their field.

From the enemies of "Marxism-Leninism", "Capital", etc. they were expecting an answer, denials in roughly the same format. That ideological rivals "on the other side of the curtain" are writing their "Antimanifesto", "Anticapital" (there was something like this ... "Antiduring"). And these "antitomes" will probably come to us along the routes of the same Iskra. That is why they bombarded poor John Keynes, or the "Convergence Theory," so diligently and preemptively. Keynes's books probably most of all resembled in outward signs "their answer to Marx."

But the actual answers turned out to be absolutely "asymmetric". First and Second World Wars "Marxism

236

Leninism" explained through (remember?) "the law of uneven development of the imperialist powers".

But Bush, in the same cited interview with our NTV on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II, explained the main fault of fascism: "non-observance of the rights of minorities" (literally). And the whole meaning of the Great War and Victory turns out to be the worldwide assertion of the rights of minorities.

The interview is "not a passing one", and today it can be found on the official website of the [US Department of State. And even the context of that conversation was, as far as possible, benevolent towards Russia. There, President Bush, after the most important recognition of the equal responsibility of the USSR, the USA, Britain for the post-war order of the world, the division into spheres of influence and the Yalta system, further issued this passage. An NTV correspondent (Vladimir Solovyov) pointed out to Mr. Bush the facts of the infringement of Russians and the fascistization of Latvian politics. And Bush promised to protect, point out Vaire-Freiberga.

State Department announcement:

President Bush says that the experience of World War II highlights the need for tolerance. "Respect for democracy means respect for the rights of minorities," states

President of Russian television.

Question. In Russia, we are very concerned about the growth of neo-Nazism in the Baltic states, when Russian war veterans are publicly humiliated, when monuments to Russian soldiers are desecrated, and at the same time, on May 8, it is planned to open a monument to the Nazi brigade, which is well known not only for military operations against Russians, but also rather vile things that were common for SS troops.

The president. Yes. When I go to the Baltic countries, I will have this message: it is important to respect democracy, but to respect democracy means to respect the rights of minorities. In other words, true democracy proclaims that minorities matter and that the will of the majority cannot suppress the minority.

As for whether countries honor Nazism, of course, this should be rejected. Nazism was defeated. We celebrate the defeat of Nazism. We do not want Nazism to return.

237

The extremist point of view is that it is possible to violate the rights of minorities. The Nazis exterminated millions of Jews, for example, and this is a classic example of how the rights of minorities were violated. And we must never forget the lessons of why we fought together during World War II. Therefore, I look forward to making this call for tolerance (...)

That's what this example is good for: even a positive (for Russia) move by Bush still leaves a feeling of mutual misunderstanding, a feeling of slight absurdity. It is absurd against the background of this almost touching concern: finally, there is a place where these Russians are a minority! So let's protect! The conclusion suggests itself: yes, be you (according to the context of the conversation - Russians) always and everywhere a minority, and our protection is guaranteed to you! And most importantly, he is absolutely sincere. Indeed, instincts - they do not lie! He will protect us if we become a minority!

It reminded me of the following story. One French count bred large and valuable fish (sturgeon, I think) in his ponds. The neighbor, salivating, remembered the unshakable instinct (congenital reflex) of a diving dog: to dive and pull everything that moves in the water ashore. And that sly one, having crept in, drove the dog into the count's pond. And that faithful diver pulled out - "saved" the sturgeons. Instinct is great.

In dealing with Bush's quote as conscientiously as possible, one can assume a variant: in the conditions of a television interview, the president mentioned "minority rights" for brevity, but in general he had in mind the whole complex of "human rights". But there is no mistake here, and Bush is right in his own way, reducing the entire "Bill of Rights" (a dozen "Amendments to the US Constitution") to the observance of the rights of minorities precisely as an indicator. In the same way, environmental scientists absolutely simplify: "If there are crayfish in the river, then this river is clean. So, there are other living creatures there." That is, minorities openly march through the streets, some Scientologists or, let's say, gays — "it means that everything is also completely OK with the rest of the freedoms (press, conscience, assembly!").

238

It is a little strange for us to imagine that someone has a model of the development of the world, which he considers correct, working, valid, and where the spring that sets the whole world in motion is the struggle for the rights of minorities (well, or even okay, for the whole "Bill of rights")! And that Russians in Latvia will be protected not because they fought against the German-Latvian fascists, but because at the moment they are a clearly defined statistical minority (national).

Or, for comparison, imagine a "lecture in the trenches [945], addressed to those soldiers who are just about to flood with their blood, put out the furnaces of Auschwitz. Imagine a political commissar instructing: "Now you will go on the attack, you will go under fire, but you must by all means take the settlement of Auschwitz (Auschwitz) by evening — and know that you are going into battle for the sacred, for the rights of minorities! .." Well, a clean yellow house.

Yes, it is unlikely that Lee and the soldiers landing in Normandy were told about the "terrible, inhuman threat hanging over the minority, over the entire Parisian gay bohemian! Know, fighters, that there, in Paris, Henri Gide, Cocteau are now waiting for you! ..».

And, having completed this circle of examples, let us now return to the "asymmetric responses" in ideology. So when did these "values" (consciences-assemblies-minority-presses) really appear at the forefront of world politics?

By the way, it will seem to someone that in this friendly four (the one in the line above, in brackets), one reinforces the other, and each reinforces each and all together. Bush, for example, seems to be sure of this... as well as of the "Great World War for the Rights of Minorities"... But after all, it may seem to many that it is exactly the opposite, that one discredits the other. And then, having suspected the freedom of conscience/press/assembly - in a simple cover for their "ally" from the friendly four - "minorities", - he will probably only be even more critical, even more suspicious of the very freedoms of conscience/press.

That's why, dear reader, in this story of the "Second World War. Reboot" included the topic "War and Justice" (Six feathers from each goose of the kingdom), and "Problems of the PE Department of the Corporation "Russian Federation". Yes,

239

we, as Andropov rightly noted, "do not know the society in which we live." But what if you try to find out? Here we must turn first of all to the war.

"WHAT EXACTLY CAN'T WE DO WITH THIS VICTORY? (To the question that opens this chapter)

I had one more, external reason for my "reset" reflections on the results of World War II: just by the time the work on the first edition of the book was completed, the epic, Viktor Pravdyuk's documentary film "World War II. Russian version". And after all the stories about the siege of Leningrad, the battles near Moscow, Stalingrad, the Kursk Bulge, the war on the Western Front, the author, somewhere ... already in the 57th - 60th series (the titles of the series are very colorful: "Lessons in the crimson light of the results", "Who won the Second World War?") finally got to his ... "historical conclusions" ... And at the same time he began convincingly and irresistibly ... to sit down in a galosh.

Points of his, Pravdyuk, "analysis".

1) <"/Germany, together with the USSR, defeated Poland" - he repeated this thesis simply constantly (I counted more than 8 times):

"But then, after all, Britain, together with Germany, defeated Denmark (the introduction of troops into Iceland). Britain, together with [Germany, defeated France (the destruction of the French fleet in Mers-el-Kebir, BEFORE the French signed peace with [Germany), the Czech Republic and Lithuania (in its Memel part), together with Germany, attacked the USSR .. It turns out, no in - in general, there is no history of the Second World War, moreover, there is no Second World War itself, but there is a chaos of attacks, declarations, mutual accusations, some unimaginable mess like a Pravdyukov film.

2) "It is a pity that the Nuremberg Trials were carried out by the winners. The results of the war could be correctly analyzed if the Nuremberg trials were entrusted to be carried out by neutrals. Because the winners were in the end as cruel as the Nazis.

So, go ahead, Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, you are invited. Judge you, suppliers of German iron (seam

240

dy), or you, the keepers of Nazi gold (Swiss), weigh ...

What is there to answer? As everyone could see, the author of the film Viktor Pravdyuk said all this, sitting under a huge icon. The whole film - his direct speech was in this sub-icon interior. I hope that it was not just a detail of the shooting props. Yes, it seems that the topic itself involves an appeal to religious authorities: after all, any court (especially the Nuremberg trials!) can in some way be correlated with the main court of mankind - the Last Judgment.

I will try to explain myself with the help of one of the main Christian thinkers: Saint (for Catholics) or blessed (for Orthodox) Augustine. His books "Confession", "On the City of God" and in general "Augustine's system" for a millennium "determined the consciousness and cultural image of European man". Augustine's phrase "I believe that I may understand" is repeated in every church in the world. "Teacher and Anticipator" of Petrarch, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche. Martin Luther was considered the interpreter of Augustine. Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Freud are his students.

Directly on this - about the war, about the degree of military guilt - Augustine did not say anything, but there is a completely working analogy - his postulate about the mass of sin (ta\$za ressay): "Original sin plus the conditions of our worldly life constantly lead to increase in the mass of sin. Possidius, a disciple of the Bishop of Kalam and the first biographer of Augustine, writes:

"He conveyed the instructions that should be followed in life and deeds by a man of God (meaning a priest): not to ask a wife for someone, not to give recommendations to those who are going to serve in the army. In each case, he (Augustine) presented the reason: 1) so that the spouses, quarreling among themselves, do not scold the one who arranged their marriage, the priest should only consolidate the already concluded union, bless mutual affection; 2) so that a person who has shown himself poorly in military service does not share the shame with the one who recommended him.

"Concrete thinkers" may wonder about these rules: after all, family disasters, like failures in the army, are rarer options than normal family life and normal service. So if sacred

241

the nickname will still recommend wives or soldiers for service, the amount of gratitude in the end will outweigh the amount of claims.

So, Augustine, the foremost expert on the human soul, answers:

"They won't outweigh. They won't overdo it."

And this already applies to our topic: for example, a million people were liberated from fascist slavery, a thousand died in the process, five hundred were shot - well, in the heat of the moment, suspecting of complicity, in a combat situation. And what, here you can "turn on statistics"? Throw on the balance - a million thanks and fifteen hundred curses?

This is at the very foundation of human life: worldly gratitude, as it were, dissolves in worldly life, is spent in the process of maintaining it, while sin, the mass of sin accumulates... cumulative effect.

Usefulness, that's right, that's why the usefulness that is used disappears. Used is a synonym for empty. Then the "concrete" utility of some thing will appear when it happens... what happens to gasoline in the combustion chamber. And sin, it turns out, is a substance of a completely different kind. The theologians of teachings long ago deduced the basis of the general Christian teaching of Blessed Augustine:

"[rex is not overcome by any bunch of good deeds, but only by the Grace of God."

And we just need to correctly apply this fundamental postulate of Christianity "to our topic". The fact that the military sins of the liberators will be remembered, and the benefits of liberation

forget, it is quite in the nature of man. And therefore, trying to avoid this, it is not necessary to curry favor with the neutrals, to ask them to carry out that "Nuremberg trial". Their alleged advantage over the liberators is only in non-participation in the war, that is, in not living a certain period of life, in not accumulating a mass of sin. This is, in fact, the advantage of a one-year-old baby over an old man. And by the way (if it was already proposed here to "nurnberg" - to children innocent in the war) ... - then one important thought of Augustine is applicable here too. For many years he studied the psychology of infants, talked with mothers, and observed children himself. Its conclusion crosses out entire centuries of banal

242

a lot of lisp, but also sad: "Infants are innocent in their bodily weakness, and not in their souls" (Augustine - "On the City of God").

So an attempt to "transfer Nuremberg" somewhere to prosperous, peaceful Stockholm is akin to an attempt to replace judges today (possible bribe-takers and sinners) with a child of two years old ("before this age, he doesn't know what a bribe is").

Pravdyuk's third point:

3) "Attack" on Marshal Zhukov. Allegedly, Operation Mars is his (Zhukov's) biggest defeat.

It was some American colonel who "opened his eyes" to the authors of the film. They, the authors of the film, seem to be surprised themselves (maybe sincerely) how terrible everything is, everything is totally hidden in this war, hushed up, and suddenly here it is - "a stunning discovery-exposing an American colonel!".

Indeed, during the Battle of Stalingrad, on another sector of the front, near Rzhev, our troops attacked the Germans for a long time and to no avail, and suffered enormous losses. Looking at this section of the war, at this separate section of the front, one can really be horrified at the senselessness of our attacks, the enormity of our losses. BUT ... And if we link this operation "Mars" precisely with the parallel battle at Stalingrad? ..

No, the geopolitician Andrey Parshev nevertheless correctly wrote (albeit on a different occasion): "It is possible to understand the whole brilliant strategy of Kutuzov (also criticized by many) only if you understand and recognize the unconditional tactical (on the battlefield) superiority of Napoleon!"

And now we only need to recognize the unconditional, overwhelming superiority of the Wehrmacht of that time - in maneuverability, in the speed of transfers and the deployment of large military groups, and then the picture will become clearer. The absolute importance and priority of Stalingrad seems to be known to everyone. But after all, it is just as well known that only the transferred Manstein group almost broke through to the encircled 6th Army of Paulus - almost turned the tide of the main battle of the war.

That is why it was necessary to "bind, grind" the Rzhev grouping with the most "meaningless and bloody

243

attacks", because otherwise they (the Germans) would have "switched on" it in the south much sooner, more effectively! Much faster and more successful than our own "liberated near Rzhev" armies. Dozens of proofs of this have accumulated over the years 1941-42. The same Manstein was transferred to the Crimea - and our complete defeat. Our Barvenkovsky ledge near Kharkov - the Germans regrouped there, hit and ... in fact, from near Kharkov and marched home to Stalingrad and the Caucasus. And besides, check it out! — in the previous winter campaign (1941/42), the Germans were already "in the cauldron" near Demyansk — and successfully released! And so that this would not happen again at Stalingrad, it was necessary to tie up all kinds of "German surpluses" on all fronts!

And such examples, isolated in time or place, in the history of wars can be collected endlessly. Prove anything and everything. And Wellington's loss of Waterloo, and the absolute invincibility of Hitler, and the mediocrity of the "butcher Zhukov", and everything, everything, everything ... You just need to isolate the necessary piece from the chain of history, like that American colonel. And then... millions of those initiated into the mystery at once will freeze dumbfounded... "Here the stoker opened our eyes!.." - so, it seems, was in one song of Galich.

Rb. And it is so natural that Pravdyuk's semantic failure is accompanied by a striking stylistic failure! Has anyone paid attention to the very name of that film series: "Lessons in the Crimson Light of the Results" - this is pure wampuka!

A POEM AND A HALF (Lyric digression)

In accordance with the practice already established in this book of searching for, if possible, unerasable examples, more or less original illustrations, as an example of understanding one's country, war, history, I will cite two poems (more precisely, even one and a half: one in its entirety, the other in excerpts).

Their external reason is completely, absolutely identical: the participation of the Italians in the war with us. And this is very useful: in such particulars, secondary (supposedly) powers, the meaning of the general is better revealed.

244

So, let's start with that sketchy one. In the sixth grade, it seems, by the Victory Day we were learning the "literary and artistic composition". They just stood in a line and read in turn the most famous poems about the war. I got this:

A black cross on the chest of an Italian, No carving, no pattern, no gloss.

Protected by a poor family And carried by his only son.

And something else there...

... A young native of Naples, What did you leave in Russia on the field?

I remember well that the whole poem was built on these sonorous Russian-Italian rhymes ... somehow: .. I dreamed of riding in a gondola at least once in the Volga free area ...

... But my bullets did not whistle Over the sacred land of Raphael ...

..I am now trying to recall the "meaning-forming" Russian-Italian rhymes of the poem, and I find myself not remembering anymore, but thinking it out (about our folk song "Lucina" and their "Santa Lucia").

And quite deliberately, I will not now look for the name of the author, reconstruct the entire correct text. Let it remain so, as I remember it 39 (approximately) years ago. Sonorous, beautiful, included in the classics of Soviet poetry. The author - if you still find it - will definitely turn out to be among the top ten of our poets. Rozhdestvensky, Mezhirov, Narovchatov, Simonov--Svetlov, Voznesensky-Yevtushenko... Or maybe even one of them.

Doesn't matter.

For all of the above is only a necessary lead to that other work, which shows completely unexpectedly, amazingly unexpectedly! - what, it turns out, can be seen behind the same particular (military-Italian) case!

I don't even know if this can be called a poem - one detail, incredible for this genre, immediately catches your eye: the epigraph is almost longer than the text itself.

245

PETRARCH

... And now an unusual, but already endless string of bonded people of both sexes darkens this most beautiful city with Scythian features and disorderly confusion, like a muddy stream over a clean river; if they weren't dearer to their customers than to me, if they didn't please their eyes more than mine, the inglorious tribe would not crowd along the local narrow alleys, would not grieve with unpleasant meetings visitors accustomed to the best pictures, but in the depths of their The Scythians, together with the thin and pale Need, among the stony field, where Nason placed her (Need), with teeth and nails, the meager plants would tear. However, enough about that.

Petrarch. From a letter to Guido Setta, archbishop [enui. 1367 Venice.

So he wrote several years before Kulikov's sacred thunderstorm. How he would act is not a secret, If given him power, not a word.

So he wrote in a cherished style, So he looked at our brother. Overgrown with these meetings would come true, That it was overshadowed once.

After all, six centuries have passed

Above the heavenly and stone vault.

But in the soul of a humanist grew

A vague fear of the Scythian confusion.

Like a magnet pulled the horizon

Where strangers are burning Palestine.

He ended up on the Voronezh front And fled for yards and barns.

In forty-three, in a fierce wind, the Italians staggered like shadows, Peeling off the bark with their nails.

From under the snow with scarce plants.

He wandered around the rear, like a spirit, And chewed last year's leaves. He begged for bread from the old women - He recognized these Scythian faces.

246

And no one drove from the threshold,

Bread and shelter sharing with the poet. He got to know the others too late. But I found out. And enough about that.

It's just unbelievable, the hand reaches out to rub your eyes - but the feeling of a miracle remains. So Moses, probably, looked at the burning bush or parted waters. By some completely incomprehensible movement (perhaps, by a shift in the angle of view), one absolutely particular case suddenly becomes a stepping stone of the entire world history. And this "staircase" itself suddenly receives a completely unexpected illumination.

It suddenly becomes clearly visible, clearer than a solved crossword puzzle, this really "great humanist", poet and scientist Petrarch is understandable. Today he would probably be a member of the European Parliament. He came to Russia in 1941 not to "rob", and not even "on the orders of the evil Duce", but precisely as a "great poet, scientist and humanist"...

Dante, Petrarch. The creators of the "new beautiful world"... Europe, Culture, Renaissance. And suddenly in this bright and reasonable world - like some kind of stain or swirling fear in the corner. Either some kind of "systemic", military-political threat, or a gloomy surge of the subconscious. And the creator of the "correct world" - he, of course, will reach out, go there in order to explore and get rid of his "vague fear of the Scythian confusion" ... And there Petrarch will see that very Need - an image that was born even in his predecessor, Nason, who was exiled to Scythia by Emperor Augustus. And he will "tear the meager plants with his nails." And "recognizes those Scythian faces"...

And not just a testament to the skill of the author, our Poet, but also of tremendous philosophical importance, the convergence of these two texts, Italian and Russian, at one point becomes - "and that's enough about that." Like two rays converging at the top, at the point of dazzling insight. After all, Petrarch could cut off those depictions of Slavic humiliation and disgrace in a letter to the archbishop simply because he was too lazy to describe anything else here. Or sorry ink. And he could also ... because of the rise of pity, compassion, generosity. But what exactly: boredom or pity is unknown to the readers of the text of his letter to the Archbishop of Genoa. Maybe it wasn't

247

it is also known to Petrarch himself, who threw away his pen at that moment: "enough about that." And it is here that the Russian ray, the text of the Russian Poet, converging to the same point, as if illuminates the subconscious of the Italian, affirms in him the best possible option: Generosity. Yes, yes, that was compassion. And, "having recognized these Scythian faces", he, the famous Petrarch, himself became better, more enlightened. Great wars end with generosity. (And Russia has somehow already been called "the subconscious of the West.")

This is the contribution to the whole process of "world humanization" of the Voronezh old women who fed the unfortunate Italian, but also the Russian Poet, the interlocutor of Petrarch, the author of this masterpiece.

But... this contribution of the Poet also poses a very difficult choice for his compatriots and colleagues (or those who consider themselves to be). This is the scale. The level of comprehension of the world war, world history is presented. And here (colleagues?) there are options: 1) either admit, admit that because of you, it is on your book that this level will suddenly drop; 2) or, as they used to say, they frightened each other in the 70s and 80s: "go to the machine", "to the tractor". Or...

AMATEUR INQUIRIES

So who is this poet who so successfully brought together Petrarch, Mussolini's unfortunate soldiers with Russian, world history?

(Pause) - It seems like a pleasant thing to "advertise" our poetic genius, but it seems somehow even insulting that this should be done.

So, this Poet is Yuri Polikarpovich Kuznetsov.

This is what is called "deal with the topic." Not only to besiege some Lithuanians who are drawing the bill, but the most important thing is to advance the comprehension of their own history...

Of the all-Union literary disputes that were once in full swing, one popular question now came to mind: "Who and when will write a new "War and Peace"? It meant a book about the Great Patriotic War. Yes, such a book would greatly help the formation of national identity. The very fact of the existence of such a huge and meaningless event (war) is even dangerous in its own way. It is even dangerous, and it is for today's Russians. With its rawness,

248

arrogance, thoughtlessness. This gigantic topic will still attract public consciousness. And in the absence of a new Leo Tolstoy, all sorts of people will crawl through, up to cuts. AND

what they said instead of enlightenment and unity will only deepen the lines of splits in national mentality.

"War and Peace", as we remember, was called "the greatest novel ever written" by the Frenchman Romain Rolland. Although the "Tolstoy Napoleon" is, perhaps, the most vile and insignificant in the entire "Napoleonian" ...

Yes, finding one's own History, "knowing one's country" is much more important than all these "pokes" and "pointing to the place" by former subjects of Hitler.

And with History, with the knowledge of one's country, people, it turns out that, except at turning points, it is very difficult to comprehend anything. It seems that in other, calm periods, they - the people, the country - are simply "things in themselves." Well, imagine that Alexander Sergeevich would transfer the action of his "Boris [Odunov]" from 1605 somewhere deep into his quite successful reign. And this is a rich choice: and 14 years of "premiership" under Fyodor Ioannovich (Belgorod was founded, the entire region of the present "Chernozem region" was equipped, fortified, populated). Or the no less successful "seven-year plan" of Godunov's own reign (even the war with Sweden was won, the losses of Ivan [the Terrible — that same Votskaya Pyatina, access to the Baltic Sea) were repulsed... But what would we learn from Boris Godunov-1598" about the soul of the people, mysteriously, incomprehensibly how, but nevertheless, it turned out to be broken by the oprichnina and Ivan the Terrible? What would the "successfully overfulfilled seven-year plan of Boris Godunov" reveal to us on the very eve of the Time of Troubles?

RESULTS OF "THE SECOND WORLD RELOAD"

It is impossible to operate with the results of the world war in terms of modern politically correct hangouts. It is in the interests of Truth and in the interests of Russia (in principle, also in the interests of other warring countries — Britain, Serbia) not to discuss the last war in modern terms, but, on the contrary, to consider the current political situation using the criteria of the last war.

249

And if out of every ten international disputes today (for example, about the seizure of oil fields under the guise of "defending democratic freedoms") at least half are translated from "democratic language" to "geopolitical" or to "military-historical", there would be less confusion.

Yes, there is no getting away from the theme of the Great War. The one that, according to Bruce Catton, takes command herself. World War II was just that.

The version of the "Great War", a war without any pacts, without "declaring oneself from such and such an hour, such a number in a state of ...", reveals the true scope of the war. Pushes the time frame. The "Great War", forgive me for this half-citation of the Gospel, "does not come in a conspicuous way."

And today, the version of the "Great War" brings back "to the front line" some of the participants, reminding them on which side they acted...

War is, in any case, contact with Reality. Catharsis. tragic cleansing. And politics, conceptual tools, the lexicon itself in times of peace gradually and absolutely inevitably, in the pursuit of momentary benefits, the alignment becomes more complicated, confusing, and lies - exactly until the next war. Until the next catharsis. Actually, the deceit, the contradictions of the "peace policy" always launched the next war.

Understand, this is by no means an apology for military style. It is not war that is so good, but "peaceful, civil politics", which is slipping into intrigues around a fraction of a percentage of the fooled electorate, is so bad.

If you look "philosophically", "dialectically", it turns out that... War, in any case, has always brought peace closer. And "peace" and "peaceful politicians, historiographers, etc." - they (at least until now) have always brought the war closer.

And always the "post-war years" slowly turned into "pre-war years".

Part Two "WAR AND PEACE... AND WAR"

The second part of this book, dedicated to the Cold War, traces the lines of force, the threads of information found during the formation of United Europe-1 (Berlin) and by no means cut short in the memorable spring of 1945. It turns out that the most interesting phenomenon of the Cold War has its own "reset", which also promises a lot of mini-discoveries. Analyzing the many unformalized laws of this "war", outlining all kinds of "theatres" where it took place, and offering my own explanations for the reasons for its loss by the Soviet Union, I had the opportunity to converse with people at the same time (for example, an interesting and in demand today economist and philosopher Mikhail Khazin, conversation with him in the journal *Druzhba Narodiv*, No. 6, 2009), which quite convincingly say that the Soviet Union practically won the Cold War. Or, in any case, the USSR won the arms race against the United States in the 1970s, but our then political leaders were absolutely unprepared, did not know what to do with this world leadership. They got scared and gave up.

Chapter 1 FULTON. DECLARATION OF WAR

On March 5, 1946, at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri, former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill (the incumbent US President Harry Truman stood a little further away) delivered his famous speech. In which, in fact, the "cold war" was declared to us.

To date, a kind of "Cold War Museum" has developed in Fulton. In 2006 for the 60th anniversary

251

Churchill's daughter Lady Mary Soames and his granddaughter Edwina Sandis, as well as Truman's great-nephew, were invited. They also invited the President of the United States, George W. Bush, and British Prime Minister Tony Blair, but they declined the invitation.

And on previous anniversaries of the Fulton speech, many world leaders and politicians gathered at Westminster College, including former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. We may see the latter again. After all, what, if you imagine, is a cool background for an advertising campaign: "Hot pizza will help in the Cold War too !!!"

For the 60th anniversary, the exposition was updated in Fulton and the Churchill memorial and library were redesigned at a cost of \$4 million. In addition, the symbolic beginning of the global confrontation was marked by a special service at the Church of St. Mary on the territory of Westminster College.

So: why Churchill (then a retired goat drummer)? Why exactly Fulton (the backwoods is utter)?

Before reproducing Sir Winston's "Selected passages from a speech..." and Iosif Vissarionovich Stalin's answers to "Churchill and the world" in *Pravda*, we give two "guiding" quotations:

1) Anatoly Utkin wrote an excellent book about Churchill, where, among many other things, there is ... let's call it: "the everyday side of Fulton."

2) We will use the work of the historian Valentin Falin for a brief outline of the then geopolitical "layout".

Anatoly Utkin:

"To President Harry Truman, proud of his simplicity and accessibility, countrymen from Missouri began to arrive with small requests. In January 1946, they asked to send some of the senators to open an ordinary college in the Missouri town of Fulton. A patriot of his regions, President Truman reacted unexpectedly: "Why should we ask tongue-tied senators when the biggest golden-tongued Anglo-Saxon world, retired Prime Minister Winston Churchill, is now resting in Florida?" Churchill responded to the request, putting forward only one condition: "I will speak

252

I'm sorry if the President of the United States is present in the hall." Truman agreed.

Churchill's infamous speech at Fulton corresponded with the mood of the right-wing forces in the United States, who decided to "sort things out" with the East. The "fraternal association of English-speaking peoples", about which the ex-premier spoke, was to become a military alliance, because, as Churchill argued, "nothing makes a greater impression on Russians than force". This was the beginning of the tragic path of the arms race (...).

Valentin Falin:

"At the final stage of the war, the USSR did not pose a threat to the "free world". Moscow had somewhat different concerns. It was necessary to raise the country from the ruins, and not dream of quasi-communist expansion. It is an established, proven fact that neither in 1945 nor in 1946 did the Soviet leadership intend to reproduce in Central and Eastern Europe models of economic, social and political structure akin to Stalinism...

This was also understood in the USA. Thus, in April 1946, General Clay, in his capacity as deputy to the American governor of Germany, reported to the State Department that the Soviet representatives on the Control Council "cannot be reproached for violating the Potsdam Accords." On the contrary, "they are fulfilling them in the highest degree of conscience," demonstrating "a sincere desire to be friends with us, as well as respect for the United States." "We," Clay concluded, "didn't believe for a moment in [the possibility of] coming Soviet aggression, and we don't believe it now."

However, Truman, who needed to sanctify the *Rah Atepsapa* doctrine, was not convinced by these considerations. It was precisely in order to somehow substantiate the claim to world hegemony that the United States needed Churchill. In favor of Churchill, from Truman's point of view, was the fact that during the war no one did more than Churchill in order to emasculate the military cooperation of the Western powers with the Soviet Union, to prevent real coordination of the actions of the armed forces of the three powers, disrupt the organization of the Second Front in 1942 and 1943 and thereby prolong the war,

253

watching with Olympian calm as the Germans and Russians bleed each other in fierce battles. In this sense, the concept of the British Prime Minister echoed the approaches of Truman, who in June 1941 said: "If the Germans win, it's worth helping the Russians; if the Russians take over, we need to help the Germans, and let them kill each other as much as possible" .

"THE UNTHINKABLE AND NEEDABLE

No later than March 1945, Churchill gave the order to collect captured German weapons and store them for possible use against the USSR. July 1945 with the forces of 112-113 divisions, including a dozen Wehrmacht divisions, which surrendered to the British and were transferred undisciplined to camps in Schleswig-Holstein and Southern Denmark. They were kept ready there until the spring of 1946.

Churchill made a lot of efforts in order to involve Truman, who assumed the presidency after the death (April 12 [1945] of Franklin Roosevelt, in the "Unthinkable". "If it weren't for the categorical affront of the leading US military leaders, Churchill's "Unthinkable" could have taken on the sinister features of the completely real and conceivable. It is even possible that with nuclear accent.

On May 19, 1945, US Assistant Secretary of State fu sent a memorandum to Truman stating that "if there is anything in the world that is inevitable, then war between the United States and the Soviet Union is such an inevitable." "It is much better and more certain to have a collision before Russia can carry out reconstruction work and develop its huge potential of military, economic and territorial power," the document stated.

On the ideological basis expressed in the ryu memorandum, in essence, there was a dismantling of Roosevelt's political legacy, including in terms of the fulfillment (or dumping) of US obligations under the Tehran and Yalta agreements.

254

pits. In parallel, a new military doctrine of the United States was being prepared at full speed. Her midwife was the successful nuclear test in Nevada (...)"

And now directly ... the main character of the first part, Sir Winston Churchill. The unstoppable "tangle of history" has led us to a period when our famous former enemy, former ally has again become an adversary. But, despite all the following comments on his speech, objections, Churchill remains our ... "conscientious adversary." This definition is—I admit—clumsy, sketchy, anticipating, I hope, a more suitable one, someday formulated. But, having become acquainted in later chapters with two iconic figures of our opponents in the beginning of the Cold War - Churchill and Brzezinski, you will see the whole difference between them, the difference even between the "types of Churchill and Brzezinski", and, I hope, you will recognize the need this division, their separation into different subspecies.

So, Winston Churchill's speech, Fulton, Missouri, on March 1946 (translated by Igor Zainetdinov):

"I was delighted to arrive at Westminster College this afternoon and receive congratulations on my degree.

The name "Westminster" is somehow familiar to me. I seem to have heard it before. At another Westminster I received most of my education in politics, dialectics, rhetoric and other things. In fact, these are related institutions.

(Joke. Playing on the name of an American college and the Westminster district of London, where the royal residence, parliament and many state institutions are located.)

The President has told you that it is his desire, and I am sure it is also yours, that I give my true and faithful assessment of this turbulent and difficult time. I will certainly use this freedom, and I feel that I have the right to do so, because any private ambition, any wild

255

the dreams I cherished in my younger years, in short, came true.

(As in one joke: "Life is good>.)

"Let me, however, make it clear that I have no official mission or status of any kind and speak only for myself. I am none other than myself. I can therefore, relying on my life experience, allow myself to express my opinion on the problems that surround us on the day after our absolute victory, and try to make sure that the strength that was obtained at the cost of many sacrifices and sufferings should be preserved for the future glory and safety of mankind.

The United States now stands at the pinnacle of world power. This is a solemn moment for American democracy. This power must be combined with a terrible responsibility for the future. If you look around you, you should feel not only a sense of accomplishment, but also anxiety, fear not to lose what has been achieved.

And here I am speaking especially of the myriad homes or families in which the wage earner struggles against the problems and difficulties of life, guards the wife and children from want and deprivation, and instills in the family the fear of God, as well as other ethical concepts of great importance. meaning.

To ensure the safety of these countless homes and families, it is necessary to protect them from two giant marauders: war and tyranny.

The terrible ruin of Europe, with all its vanishing beauty, and most of Asia stands in our eyes.

It is not possible to calculate what I call Che ipeznta {e4 zit 0 Pitap rush - "the inestimable sum of human pain." Our highest task and duty is to protect all people from the horrors and scourges of a new war.

The world organization, created for the main purpose of preventing war, the United Nations, the successor to the League of Nations, with the decisive addition of the United States and all that it means, is already in operation.

There is, however, a definite practical suggestion. Courts and judges may be created, but they cannot function without sheriffs and constables. The United Nations must immediately be equipped with an international military force.

256

I propose that each state contribute a certain number of aviation squadrons to the service of the world organization. These units would be trained and trained in their own country, but moved from one country to another. They would wear the uniforms of their own countries, but with different badges. They would not be required to act against their own nation, but would otherwise be subordinate to the world organization.

I desired to see this done after the First World War, and I sincerely believe that this can be done immediately.

It would, however, be wrong and imprudent to entrust the secret knowledge or experience of the atomic bomb that the United States, Great Britain and Canada have to an organization that is still in its infancy. People of all countries sleep peacefully in their beds because much of this knowledge and experience is in American hands.

I do not think that we would sleep so soundly if we had the opposite situation, when this deadly factor was monopolized by some communist or non-fascist states. This circumstance would be used by them to impose

totalitarian systems to a free democratic world with dire consequences. God knows that this should not happen, and we have at least some time to fortify our house before we face this danger, and even when no effort will help, we still must have a huge superiority in order to use it as a deterrent."

A LITTLE RETRACT. PHILOSOPHY OF THE WONDER BOMB

In principle, Churchill stated here an interesting topic that even has a philosophical dimension: the presence of a superweapon and the calmness of the people - how do they correlate? Since 1945, the atomic bomb has occupied a place in the mind that had been empty since ancient peoples believed in myths. A miracle weapon, Wotan's spear, the ring of the Nibelung, in essence, a magic wand of purely military use. It's a pity, but Churchill gives only two options.

257

tuations: the current one (the US has the bomb) and... hypothetical — if the bomb were monopoly possessed by "certain communist or neo-fascist states".

But, strictly speaking, there are three options for the existence of a "miracle weapon":

| 1) only the enemy;

2) only you;

3) both of them have bombs.

And this proposed classification of geopolitical states and their psychological imprints makes it possible to notice an amazing paradoxical fact. Previously, for some reason, they did not pay attention to him. Most of all, the United States was in a state of fear - just in period No. 2. It was when they monopolized the miracle weapon. It was then, at the end of the 1940s, that American fear was constantly growing and eventually caused what they, Americans, in general, are themselves ashamed of until now: "McCarthyism", "witch hunt".

Note. Chronicle of Fear.

February 1950 TV appearance by Republican Senator Joseph McCarthy: there is a list of 205 communists working in the state apparatus.

June 1950 Counterrattack weekly: report on communist "filtering" on radio and television called Red Channels. 15| The artist is required to either leave his job or confess to pro-communist activities.

Among the "victims of the black list" are not only leading actors (Chaplin), directors (Kramer), composers (Leonard Bernstein, Aaron Copland), writers, sociologists, but also scientists - Oppenheimer and Einstein, those who, in fact, handed a miracle bomb to the Americans.

And in the USSR, the first test of an atomic bomb took place in 1949. And until 1953, there was no nuclear arsenal and delivery vehicles that threatened the United States in the slightest degree ...

(Continued) Churchill: "...we still need to have a huge superiority to use this as a deterrent. In the end

258

account, when the necessary brotherhood of man is faithfully realized and embodied in a world organization with all the necessary practical guarantees to do so

effective, these powers would, of course, be granted to a world organization (emphasis mine. — And...).".

Churchill's first significant slip (the first sketch of a Cold War character)

I present here my commentary on Fulton's speech, primarily because of the discovery of such very interesting, symptomatic "slips." "...these powers" - from the previous context - are the powers for a nuclear bomb... Think about it, in fact Churchill here proposes an agreement: first (in the morning) - the necessary brotherhood of people, then (in the evening) - we will provide a bomb and all UN. Interestingly, no one has asked this question yet...

Once again, Churchill's condition: "If ... the necessary brotherhood of man is faithfully realized and embodied in a world organization with all the necessary practical guarantees." BUT! why the bomb then? some kind of realized ... "brotherhood of people"?

What I really want when this book comes out is some Western political scientist's answer to this simple question.

In the meantime, my version of the answer: "the necessary brotherhood of man" you, gentlemen, understood as the achievement of your control over the UN. Then you can provide a bomb.

And after all, in principle, the bomb at that moment is yours, you have the right to give it or not to give it! Or give, but only in controlled hands. The condition can even be recognized as fair! BUT — a highly characteristic saying!!! — this state of accountability is called "the necessary brotherhood of man."

Indeed, with the slogan of "under control" you cannot come to a foreign country to distribute grants, nurture the opposition, control, finance some elections or cancel the results of others, feed selected media or establish international tribunals. And with ... "the necessary brotherhood of man"?! (...) Very much! Seen multiple times!

259

This is the very essence of the condition, which still works to this day: your "brotherhood", "the triumph of universal human values", etc. is your control.

No, it's still not just a slip of the tongue of Sir Churchill. This is, in essence, a sketch of how this "cold war" that he proclaims will be conducted. That the ideological front will become one of the main ones, and the laws of struggle on it will be as follows.

(Continued) Churchill:

"Now I come to the second danger of those that threaten the home and ordinary people, namely, tyranny. We cannot be blind to the fact that the privileges that every citizen of the British Empire enjoys do not hold true in a significant number of countries, some of which are very powerful. In these countries, people are controlled by all-powerful police departments.

It is not our duty at this time, when there are so many difficulties, to interfere forcibly in the internal affairs of countries that we did not win in the war. But we must not stop fearlessly preaching the greater principles of freedom and human rights which are the achievement of the English-speaking world and which, through Maspa SaTsa, the Bill of Rights, Nabea\$ Sogriz, 1Pa| Boo and go and English common law find their most famous expression in the American Declaration of Independence.

Freedom should be in every home. This is the message of the British and American peoples to mankind. Let us preach what we practice and practice what we preach.

I often quote words I heard 50 years ago from a great Irish-American speaker, my friend Wotzke SosKhap: "There is enough for everyone. The earth is a generous mother; she will provide enough food for all her children if they work her soil according to the law and in the world."

Eh, I would like to know what the respected Voshke SosKhap said (or would say) about oil! Or some of the children have to ... - that, sir.

260

— Neither confidence in the prevention of war, nor a continuous rise in the level of world organization will be obtained without the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples. This signifies a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and the USA. Continuing to discuss the method of implementing our overall strategic concept, I am at a loss as to why I have come here and what I am talking about here.

This fragment intonationally reminds me of the woeful exclamation-questioning of the Emperor Tiberius, which Churchill is probably familiar with: "How can I write to you, fathers-senators, what to write and what not to write yet? May I die the worst of deaths, if I know it..."

There is, however, an important question we must ask. Will the special relationship between the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations be in conflict with loyalty to the world organization? I reply that, on the contrary, it is probably the only means for an organization to reach its full height and strength. An example of this is the special relationship between the United States and Canada that I have just mentioned, as well as the special relationship between the United States and the South American republics. We British have had an agreement of cooperation and mutual assistance with Soviet Russia for 20 years.

I agree with Mr. Bevin, British Foreign Secretary, that we are interested in an agreement for 50 years. We seek mutual assistance and cooperation. The British have an alliance with Portugal, unbroken since 1384, which has had fruitful results at critical moments in the last war.

The Dark Ages may return, the Stone Age may return on the glittering wings of science, and what might now be a shower of immeasurable material wealth for mankind may bring utter destruction.

Well, let's recognize here the wonderful image of Churchill: the Stone Age can return on the sparkling wings of science.

"Beware, I say; time may be short. Don't let yourself drift through life before it's too late. If there is any fraternal association like

261

as I have described, with all the extra strength and security that both our countries can guarantee, make sure that this great fact is known to the world, that it contributes to the stabilization of the foundations of the world. There is a path of wisdom. Prevention is better than fix.

But this is just pure Gogol. His parting words to youth from Dead Souls. Compare: "Take with you on the road, emerging from your soft youthful years into a severe hardening courage, take with you all human movements, do not leave them on the road, do not lift
Then".

An interesting coincidence, probably speaking about the unity of human nature.

A shadow fell over the scene, recently illuminated by the victory of the allies. Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and the communist international organization intend to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits of their expansion and proselytizing tendencies. I have great admiration and respect for the brave Russian people and for my comrade-in-arms, Marshal Stalin. There is deep sympathy and benevolence in England—I have no doubt about it—for all the Russian people, and the resolve to work steadfastly, in spite of many differences and problems, to establish a lasting friendship. We understand Russia's need to secure her western borders by removing all possibility of German aggression. We welcome Russia to her rightful place among the leading nations of the world. We salute her flag on the seas.

...However, I am sure that you would like me to present the facts, as I see them, about the present situation in Europe.

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, the Iron Curtain stretches across the continent. On the other side of the imaginary line are all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia - all these famous cities and settlements around them are in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and everything is subordinated, in one form or another, not only to the Soviet influence, but very strong and in many cases extremely strong control of Moscow.

262

So this historical iron curtain appears. It must be admitted that our "political observers" were inaccurate when they explained to us that in Filton "Churchill pulled" him. We received the original text of the speech recently and we see that Churchill states rather that "the USSR has drawn the curtain" than calls. And the question is, is it necessary to refute, to refute on each point? "No, it was the Americans who fenced themselves off from us"?... After all, if we also recall the section of this "curtain" made in a different material: reinforced concrete (the Berlin Wall), then, of course, we admit: the "curtain" is ours. Job. And what was there to hide?! The installation of the "curtain" is a defensive action, and if we recall those painful thoughts of Stalin about the arrangement of the received sphere of influence ("Without theory, we will perish"), then the tragedy is presented in a completely different light. Here the allies and all of Europe recognized the right of the USSR to the security belt. The right of the USSR to ensure the establishment of loyal, friendly governments there.

Because the former states, built on enmity, fulfilled the role of a "cordon sanitaire" in one direction, isolating the USSR. On the other hand, for aggression from the West to the East, they, on the contrary, worked as a springboard. No one knows exactly in what terms Stalin outlined this problem at Yalta, but here is the result: the USSR received the right of influence on this side of the Szczecin-Trieste line. Simply because the Versailles structures built after the First World War collapsed uniquely quickly and shamefully.

But how to combine "loyalty" and economic mobility of the governments of "their own zone"? This is the real question.

— The Russian-controlled Polish government has been encouraged to make big and unwarranted attacks on Germany, and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale sad and unimaginable are now taking place. The communist parties, which were very small in all the eastern states of Europe, seized power everywhere

263

do and received unlimited totalitarian control. Police governments predominate in almost every case, and so far, apart from Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy anywhere.

Well, here Stalin gave an excellent answer (see below "Answers...").

— Turkey and Persia are also deeply alarmed and concerned about the demands that the Moscow government makes of them. The Russians made an attempt in Berlin to create a quasi-communist party in their German occupation zone, especially supporting a group of German left leaders.

If the Soviet government now attempts to separately create a pro-communist Germany in their zone, this will cause serious new difficulties in the British and American zones and will divide the defeated Germans between the Soviets and the Western democracies.

Yes, the USSR made "demands" to the Iraqis. As presented by England and the USA. But it would be interesting today to ask "Turkey", and at the same time Iraq and "Persia": whose demands for them were more moderate, reasonable? True, you can only ask the "Persians". Since the recent demands of the heirs of Churchill and Truman to Iraq turned out, as they say in the minutes, "incompatible with the life (of the country)">.

- Any conclusions can be drawn from these facts - and the facts are as follows: this, of course, is not the liberated Europe for which we fought. This is not what is needed for permanent peace.

The security of the world requires a new unity in Europe, from which no nation must stand aloof. Because of the quarrels between the strong races in Europe, all wars took place, both in the past, and the world war that we were witnesses of. And before the Iron Curtain that lies across Europe, there are many reasons for concern.

Serious difficulties are caused in Italy by the Communist Party by supporting the demands of the communist retinue (rump) Marshal Tito to change the Italian territory in the Adriatic. However, Italy's future is in balance.

264

Again, one cannot imagine a restored Europe without a strong France. All my adult life I have worked for a strong France, and I have never lost faith in her fate, even in her darkest hours. I won't lose faith now. However, in a large number of countries far from the Russian borders and all over the world, communist "fifth columns" destabilize and work in complete unity and absolute obedience to the decrees they receive from the communist center. In addition, in the British Commonwealth and in the United States, where communism is still in its infancy, communist parties or "fifth columns" constitute a growing challenge and danger to Christian civilization.

The prospect in the Far East and especially in Manchuria is also worrying. The agreement that was signed at Yalta, to which I was involved, was extremely favorable to Soviet Russia, but it took place at a time when no one could say that the German war would last all summer and autumn of 1945 and that The Japanese war was expected to continue for another 18 months after the end of the German war. In this country, you are all so well informed about the Far East and such devoted friends of China that there is no need to rant further on this subject.

This is him just in case - he apologizes for giving away a lot in Yalta. Explains the ongoing war then.

— I felt obliged to portray the shadow that, both in the West and in the East, falls on the world. I was a high minister at the time of the Versailles agreement and a close friend of Lloyd George, who was head of the British delegation at Versailles. I myself did not agree with many things that I saw, but I was left with a very strong impression about this situation, and I find it painful to compare it with what prevails now. In those days there were high hopes and boundless certainty that the wars were over and that the League of Nations had become all-powerful. I don't see or feel the same certainty, or even the same

the most hopeful in a tormented world at the present time. On the other hand, I am more of the opinion that war is coming than that it is inevitable.

265

I am sure that our fate is still in our own hands and that it is in our power to save the future, that I feel that I am obliged to speak about it whenever I have the opportunity and opportunity to do so. I do not believe that Soviet Russia wants war. That their desires are the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrine. But what we must consider today, while there is still time, is the permanent prevention of war and the establishment of the conditions of freedom and democracy as quickly as possible in all countries. Our difficulties and dangers will not disappear if we turn a blind eye to them. They will not disappear simply by waiting for what is to happen; and will not be removed by the appeasement policy. A settlement is needed, and the longer it is delayed, the more difficult it will be and the greater the danger.

Because I saw our Russian friends and allies during the war, I am convinced that there is nothing they admire more than strength, and there is nothing that they respect less than weakness, especially military weakness. . For this reason, the old doctrine of the balance of power is unfounded.

If Western democracies stand together in strict observance of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, their influence in promoting those principles will be enormous, and no one will be able to interfere with them.

If, however, they are divided or waver in their duties, and if these important years pass without benefit, then indeed a catastrophe may overwhelm us all.

The last time I saw this and shouted loudly to my compatriots and the world, no one paid attention. Before 1933, or even before 1935, Germany could be saved from the terrible fate that befell her, and we could all be saved from the disasters that Hitler brought to a free humanity. There has never been a war in all of history that could have been more easily averted by timely action than one that had just devastated such large areas of the globe.

This could have been prevented, in my deep conviction, without firing a shot, and Germany could have been powerful, prosperous and great today; but no one listened, and one by one we were all sucked into the terrible whirlpool.

266

And here Churchill is not a "rabid enemy", but a really valuable, most valuable witness. If he says that [itler was easy to keep at any of the frontiers of 1933-1938, then, of course, he is right. That is why there is such an "anti-Munich" fuse in the corresponding chapters of this book ... And spit once again in the eyes of Bukovsky - Rezun and others! Their hype of the Soviet-German pact of 1939 is the most filthy hired falsification!

"We certainly must not let this happen again. Only now, in 1946, can a good understanding be reached on all points with Russia, under the general authority of the United Nations and keeping this good understanding after many years of peace, in accordance with a world instrument supported by all the power of the English-speaking world and all his formations.

9 days after Churchill's Fulton speech, "Answers ..." by I.V. Stalin.

ANSWERS I.V. STALIN TO A PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT

The other day, one of Pravda's correspondents turned to Comrade Stalin with a request to clarify a number of questions connected with Mr. Churchill's speech. Comrade Stalin gave the appropriate explanations, which are given below in the form of answers to the correspondent's questions.

Question. How do you assess Mr. Churchill's last speech in the United States of America?

Answer. I regard it as a dangerous act calculated to sow seeds of discord among the Allied States and hinder their cooperation.

Question. Can it be considered that Mr. Churchill's speech is detrimental to the cause of peace and security?

Answer. Certainly yes. In fact, Mr. Churchill is now in the position of warmongers. And lord

267

Churchill is not alone in this - he has friends not only in England, but also in the United States of America. It should be noted that Mr. Churchill and his friends are strikingly reminiscent in this respect [of Hitler and his friends. Hitler began the business of starting the war by proclaiming the racial theory, declaring that only people who spoke German constituted a complete nation. [Mr. Churchill begins the business of unleashing war also with racial theory, arguing that only nations that speak English are full-fledged nations, called upon to decide the fate of the whole world. German racial theory led Hitler and his friends to the conclusion that the Germans, as the only complete nation, should dominate other nations. The English racial theory leads Mr. Churchill and his friends to the conclusion that the nations that speak English, as the only sound ones, should dominate the rest of the nations of the world.

In fact, Mr. Churchill and his friends in England and the USA are presenting to the non-English-speaking nations a kind of ultimatum: accept our domination voluntarily, and then everything will be all right, otherwise war is inevitable.

But the nations shed their blood during five years of brutal war for the sake of the freedom and independence of their countries, and not to replace the rule of the Hitlers with the rule of the Churchills. It is quite probable, therefore, that the non-English-speaking nations, which at the same time constitute the vast majority of the world's population, will not agree to go into a new slavery.

The tragedy of Mr. Churchill is that he, like an inveterate Tory, does not understand this simple and obvious truth.

There is no doubt that Mr. Churchill's directive is a directive for war, a call for war with the USSR. It is also clear that such a directive of Mr. Churchill is incompatible with the existing alliance treaty between Britain and the USSR. True, Mr. Churchill, in order to confuse readers, casually declares that the term of the Soviet-British treaty on mutual assistance and cooperation could well be extended to 50 years. But how can such a statement by Mr. Churchill be reconciled with his attitude towards war with the USSR and his preaching of war against the USSR? It is clear that these things

268

cannot be combined. And if Mr. Churchill, who calls for war with the Soviet Union, at the same time considers it possible to extend the term of the Anglo-Soviet treaty to 50 years, this means that he regards this treaty as an empty piece of paper, which he needs only to cover up it and disguise their anti-Soviet attitude. Therefore, one cannot take seriously the false statements of Mr. Churchill's friends in England about the extension of the

Soviet-British treaty up to 50 years or more. Extending the term of the contract does not make sense if one of the parties violates the contract and turns it into an empty piece of paper.

Question. How do you assess that part of Mr. Churchill's speech where he attacks the democratic system of the European states neighboring us and where he criticizes the good neighborly relations established between these states and the Soviet Union?

Answer. This part of Mr. Churchill's speech is a mixture of elements of slander with elements of rudeness and tactlessness.

Mr. Churchill asserts that "Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, Sofia - all these famous cities and the population in their districts are in the Soviet sphere and all are subject in one form or another not only to Soviet influence, but also to a largely increasing control of Moscow." Mr. Churchill qualifies all this as the limitless "expansionist tendencies" of the Soviet Union.

It does not take much effort to show that Mr. Churchill is here rudely and shamelessly slandering both Moscow and the named states neighboring the USSR.

In the first place, it is absolutely absurd to speak of the exclusive control of the USSR in Vienna and Berlin, where there are allied control councils composed of representatives of four states and where the USSR has only 1/4 of the votes. It happens that other people cannot but slander, but you still need to know when to stop.

Here Stalin does not miss an opportunity to catch Churchill on a few private mistakes. Churchill talks about the total control of the USSR on the other side of the "curtain" -

269

and Stalin recalls: there are also the western parts of Berlin and Vienna. But it is clear that the point is not to catch Churchill on these almost slips of the tongue. The real, agonizing question is organizing the lives of tens of millions within your sphere of influence. In the absence of even the slightest bit of experience, a set of ideas, techniques that the former allies have. Here is Churchill's most colossal advantage. And the bomb... what's the bomb? In three years there will be a bomb (Kurchatov is an honest and capable person)...

Stalin, literally in the next paragraph, explains the essence of the issue: the colossal sacrifices of the Soviet people, which ensured the liberation of Europe from the Nazi yoke. The Soviet Union cannot forget about them ... wanting to secure itself for the future, it tries to ensure that in these countries there are governments loyal to the Soviet Union.

But how to combine loyalty and sustainability? To provide a field of safety for the "heroic people" before they fell into the "heroic dream", as after the First Patriotic War?

— Secondly, we must not forget the following circumstance. The Germans invaded the USSR through Finland, Poland, Romania, and Hungary. The Germans were able to make an invasion through these countries because in these countries there were then governments hostile to the Soviet Union. As a result of the German invasion, the Soviet Union irretrievably lost about seven million people in battles with the Germans, as well as due to the German occupation and the deportation of Soviet people to German penal servitude. In other words, the Soviet Union lost several times more people than England and the United States of America put together. It is possible that in some places they are inclined to consign to oblivion these colossal sacrifices of the Soviet people, which ensured the liberation of Europe from the Nazi yoke. But the Soviet Union cannot forget about them. The question is, what could be surprising in the fact that the Soviet Union, wishing to secure itself for the future, is trying to ensure that in these countries there are governments loyal to the Soviet Union? How can you qualify without losing your mind?

these peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union as the expansionist tendencies of our state?

Mr. Churchill asserts that "the Polish government, under the domination of the Russians, has been indulging in huge and unjust encroachments on Germany."

Every word here is crude and insulting slander. Today's democratic Poland is led by outstanding people. They proved in practice that they are able to protect the interests and dignity of the motherland in a way that their predecessors were not able to do. What grounds does Mr. Churchill have for asserting that the leaders of present-day Poland can allow the "domination" of representatives of any foreign states in their country? Isn't Mr. Churchill here slandering the "Russians" because he intends to sow the seeds of discord in relations between Poland and the Soviet Union?...

Mr. Churchill is dissatisfied that Poland has made a turn in its policy towards friendship and alliance with the USSR. There was a time when elements of conflicts and contradictions prevailed in relations between Poland and the USSR. This circumstance made it possible for statesmen like Mr. Churchill to play on these contradictions, to seize Poland under the guise of protection from the Russians, to intimidate Russia with the specter of war between her and Poland, and to retain the position of an arbitrator. But that time has passed, for the enmity between Poland and Russia has given way to friendship between them, and Poland, modern democratic Poland, no longer wants to be a playing ball in the hands of foreigners. It seems to me that it is precisely this circumstance that irritates Mr. Churchill and pushes him to rude, tactless antics against Poland. It's no joke to say: they don't let him play at someone else's expense...

As for Mr. Churchill's attacks on the Soviet Union in connection with the expansion of the western borders of Poland at the expense of the Polish territories seized by the Germans in the past, here, it seems to me, he is obviously distorting the cards. As is known, the decision on Poland's western borders was made at the Berlin Conference of the Three Powers on the basis of Poland's demands.

Once again Churchill was caught - the western borders of Poland were agreed upon at Yalta and Potsdam.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated that it considers Poland's demands correct and just. It is quite probable that Mr. Churchill is dissatisfied with this decision. But why does Mr. Churchill, sparing no arrows against the position of the Russians on this question, hide from his readers the fact that the decision was adopted unanimously at the Berlin Conference, that not only the Russians, but also the British and Americans voted for the decision? Why did Mr. Churchill need to mislead people?

Mr. Churchill states further that "the communist parties, which were very insignificant in all these eastern states of Europe, have attained an exceptional strength, far outnumbering them, and are striving to establish totalitarian control everywhere, police governments prevail in almost all of these countries, and up to the present time, with the exception of Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy in them.

As is known, in England one party now governs the state, the Labor Party, and the opposition parties are deprived of the right to participate in the government of England. This is what Mr. Churchill calls genuine democracy. In Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary, a bloc of several parties - from four to six parties - rules, and the opposition, if it is more or less loyal, is guaranteed the right to participate in the government. This is what Mr. Churchill calls totalitarianism, tyranny, policing. Why, on what basis - do not wait for an answer from Mr. Churchill. [Mr. Churchill does not understand what a ridiculous position he puts himself in with his loud speeches about totalitarianism, tyranny, police.

Mr. Churchill would like Poland to be ruled by Sosnowski and Anders, Yugoslavia by Mikhailovich and Pavelich, Rumania by Prince Stirbei and Radescu, Hungary and Austria by some king from the House of Habsburg, etc. Mr. Churchill wants to assure us that these gentlemen from the fascist backyard can ensure "genuine democracy." Such is the "democratism" of Mr. Churchill.

Mr. Churchill wanders about the truth when he talks about the growth of the influence of the communist parties in Eastern Europe. However, it should be noted that it is not entirely accurate. The influence of communist parties has grown not only in Eastern Europe,

272

but in almost all European countries where fascism used to dominate (Italy, Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Finland) or where German, Italian or Hungarian occupation took place (France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Getia, Soviet Union, etc.).

The growth of communist influence cannot be considered an accident. It represents a completely natural phenomenon. The influence of the Communists grew because, during the difficult years of fascism domination in Europe, the Communists proved to be reliable, courageous, self-sacrificing fighters against the fascist regime and for the freedom of peoples. Mr. Churchill sometimes refers in his speeches to "ordinary people from small houses", patting them on the shoulder like a lord and pretending to be their friend. But these people are not as simple as it might seem at first glance. They, the "ordinary people", have their own views, their own policies, and they know how to stand up for themselves. It is they, the millions of these "common people", who voted Mr. Churchill and his party in England, giving their votes to the Laborites. It is they, the millions of these "ordinary people", who isolated the reactionaries in Europe, supporters of cooperation with fascism, and gave preference to the left-wing democratic parties. It is they, the millions of these "ordinary people", having tested the communists in the fire of struggle and resistance to fascism, they decided that the communists fully deserve the trust of the people. Thus grew the influence of the communists in Europe. Such is the law of historical development.

Of course, Mr. Churchill does not like this development of events, and he sounds the alarm, appealing to force. But he also disliked the emergence of the Soviet regime in Russia after World War I. He also sounded the alarm then and organized a military campaign of "14 states" against Russia, setting himself the goal of turning back the wheel of history. But history turned out to be stronger than Churchill's intervention, and Mr. Churchill's quixotic manners led to his complete defeat at that time. I don't know if Mr. Churchill and his friends will be able to organize a new campaign against "Eastern Europe" after the Second World War. But if they succeed - which is unlikely, because millions of "ordinary people" stand guard over the cause of peace - then it is safe to say that they will be beaten in the same way as they were beaten in the past, 26 years ago.

"Is it true". [March 4, 1946

273

So, the "challenge" was thrown... and was accepted. And 7 months after the end of World War II, what was later called the "cold war" began.

Chapter 2

"AN EQUATION WITH AN UNKNOWN NUMBER OF UNKNOWN,

Generally speaking, this long-term confrontation, the competition of two systems, two blocs headed by the USSR and the USA, seems to me to be a kind of "equation with an unknown number of unknowns". It was incredibly difficult to solve this "equation", moreover, it was even difficult to understand what this "solution" consisted of. Military victory? But we remember very well that from a certain moment all politicians and statesmen declared that "a military decision

impossible". "World Revolution"? Also, historians will confirm that in the USSR the line on the world revolution was rejected since the fall of Trotsky. "Convergence"? Also a memorable term, a kind of scientific equivalent of "a draw in the USSR-USA duel". "Victory of American values"? This is a little closer to historical results — the collapse of the socialist bloc and the USSR allows many to be satisfied with this approximation. This option will also be considered. For now, let's consider some more or less known pairs of unknowns, variables in this equation. And after this enumeration of parameters, let's try to somehow look at the NOT enumerable, NOT countable. On the very same - an unknown number of unknowns, in other words - on those irrational components of the Great Competition of the two systems felt by many.

X's and Y's in Arms Equations

The "arms race", that is, the parallel competitive production of weapons and periodic measurements of the levels of armament, generally speaking, has been present throughout the history of civilizations. What is the difference between the "USA-USSR" -

274

ovskaya race? Starting with the parallel calculations of Thucydides (triremes of Athens and allies - triremes of Sparta and allies, hoplites, peltasts, archers...). And so it was until the Second World War, inclusive - the armaments were measurable (in terms of physical parameters) and commensurable. By the times described, the arsenals of weapons and weapons of mass destruction (and various delivery vehicles) had grown so qualitatively that at all disarmament negotiations the most difficult part was the coordination of a huge number of certain "correspondence tables", somehow conditionally equating bombers and MX missiles (transferred via underground railways), on the one hand, to nuclear submarines on the other... Do you remember the famous Soviet strategy of "asymmetric responses"? It is clear that a superiority of 12 aircraft carriers could be compared with 5800 tanks - only through the common denominator of the losses that theoretically could be inflicted by both types of weapons.

BUT... the most cunning dialectic of the era was that the success of the peaceful resolution of individual equations of conflicts led to the fact that a full-scale war was pushed back and pushed back, and in the arsenals of intimidation, weapons made up an increasing and large share - never (thank God!) are practically untested.

There were explosions at the training grounds, frightening "training" missile launches, maneuvers, headquarters games, but it is clear that a real equation for the balance of forces of nuclear submarines, aircraft carriers, the latest tanks and bombers can only be derived from the results of combat tests.

Yes, even at the most basic level. The summer resident, waiting for his friends, chops firewood for the bath and barbecue with a hatchet. How to equalize him with the halberdier, who cut 77 heads in 11 battles (although the halberd is also an ax) ...

That is, during this period (the USSR-USA arms race), unique translations took place:

Real Economic Costs - Real Weapons - Imaginary Damage - Real Fear.

It is on the last element of this chain of metamorphoses that special attention should be paid. It was the Reality of Fear - the inclusion of this parameter in the System of Geopolitical Equations that did not allow them to completely, as they say now, "virtualize".

275

And this second derivative of Weapon, Fear, will be interesting to think about. "Fear" in this chain does not mean at all that the population of the warring blocks is running around like characters in thrillers. The reality of his Fear is in the awareness of his threatened position and ... readiness

to work, to give a fair part of their property to the Military-Industrial Complex, just looping this chain, leading to Real Economic Costs. In political economy this was called Reproduction ("Simple..." or "Extended Reproduction"). Well, the fact that during the Cold War the Reproduction of Fear was Expanded, in general, is a provable, measurable fact.

An example that, in my opinion, deserves much more fame, reflection and even admiration. Talking about calculations, the balance of Fears, Threats, you must agree, it is important to try to consider the Threat - in its purest form, in the absolute...

Example one

ON THE DAY OF FEAR

That the Suez Canal was the main strategic point of the British Empire is well known. Like that famous British definition of Asia: "the territory east of Suez". Perhaps this psychology explains their naive attempts to equate their skirmish at El Alamein with the Battle of Stalingrad, against all known figures and facts. Rommel's corps was not allowed to approach Suez - "The Universe has survived!"

But even without any irony, the Suez Canal was the British "Dear Life", and if not captured, then at least put it out of action was very important for the Axis powers. But what, in fact, is there to "disable"? This channel has no gateways. This, in fact, is an artificial 161-kilometer strait between the Mediterranean and Red Seas, and bombing it is the same as, say, bombing the Drake Strait, Magellan Strait ... Or the English Channel (also, by the way, called "channel", "English Channel"). That is, to bomb it is to crush water in the sea, in the literal sense, too.

276

But... The Suez Canal is narrow, in some places up to 100 meters, and if you undermine passing larger ships, the canal can simply be clogged.

The Italians were, to put it mildly, not the most brave warriors - the Italian bombers were not very successful in overcoming the anti-aircraft fire of passing ships and blowing them up. Their only trick was to fly in at a time when the channel was empty and drop the magnetic mines. After all, the coastal anti-aircraft guns of the British covered hardly a tenth of the 161-kilometer Suez fairway.

Here, as in a "forced" version of a chess game, the only possible English answer is to place people along the shore, count all the mines dropped, interrupt the movement of ships and trawl until all of them are raised ... Brave British sailors stubbornly improve - Were constantly reducing the specific time for searching / raising / neutralizing Italian mines. The work of the British was also complicated by the dumped dummies, mock-ups of mines - after all, they also had to be searched for, trawled, lifted up, before making sure ...

And then the nation of Leonardo da Vinci responded with an invention that brings, say, the entire human ingenuity of the world to such limits, where behind the chains of physical, chemical, psychological laws already pure Genius looms. Or pure nonsense.

A model of a mine, made entirely ... of salt. In its seconds of flight, a splash of impact on the water, it was indistinguishable from real, combat prototypes, but then its action differed dramatically. From the impact, it split into small pieces, which quickly dissolved in the Suez water. And from the "mine" remained ... only a splash counted by the British. That is, an image in its purest form. Fear, the idea of a threat, an absolutely non-material substance, similar to the world ether or phlogiston (in the Russian version - Teplorod) of the 20th century. If one iron TNT mine took the British an average of about an hour and a half, then this one ... was not even salty by that time, but precisely the ideal, pure "idea of a mine". "Possibility mines" - she

blocked the channel for whole days of searching. Stay in the water, at least some fragment at the bottom, a lump that betrayed a hoax, a dummy -

277

one could search for these fragments. Find, verify, and subtract this spike from those counted on the channel. And so ... the British, even later, having learned about the Italian trick, still had to trawl the bottom of the canal for a certain time, trawl, scrape ... the very bottom of their fear, before someone from the authorities assumed responsibility - to resume movement.

The English writer Evelyn Waugh did not allow this plot to be forgotten, to dissolve. In a post-war travel essay, he cites his conversation with a veteran, a counter of those mine splashes on the Suez Canal...

Why is this unique story so underestimated? Don't know. Evelyn Waugh himself, the best painter of absurdities of the 20th century, "conscripted into the ranks and sent to...", like our Gogol, into "satirist writers" is underestimated just as much.

Example two

"MIDDLE AGES" - ALWAYS NEAR

After landing in Normandy, the Americans went into battle with the Germans and ... with another brand of horror: Otto Skorzeny.

Eisenhower's biography gives the following case:

"Once a jeep with several soldiers stopped in the American rear, the driver asked them to fill up a tank of Petrol. But in everyday life, Americans never call gasoline petrol. The suspects were detained, it turned out they were German saboteurs (...)

Rumors spread throughout the American front: "The same one ... Otto Skorzeny." A gigantic operation was emerging to send in German saboteurs, equipped and speaking English - in a truly menacing perfection!.. The Skorzeny brand earned its full power.

"... Among the allied soldiers and officers, rumors spread, one more incredible than the other. That in addition to sabotage spreading panic, saboteurs were ordered to kidnap or kill the commander-in-chief - Eisenhower.

During the entire operation, only one group was discovered, namely the one with the "petrol", but the very accident of capture, the folklore-slang detail frightened the Americans most of all ...

278

Military patrols (multiplied many times) began to grab all the suspicious. But how to identify a saboteur when the "great and terrible Skorzeny" can perfectly forge the form, documents, language, accent?! His famous glider landing and Mussolini's rescue stunt was on everyone's lips. In the mass consciousness, Skorzeny has already completely squeezed, probably, Houdini himself.

And then the American patrols began to "ask questions that every American should answer. Who is Mickey Mouse, what is the nickname of this or that baseball star.

Here already a certain graceful loop of intrigue appears: they began to fight with the folklore monster Skorzeny with the help of folklore...

But the case of General Bradley was an even more beautiful plot twist.

In the midst of the "hunt for saboteurs" on the road, the commander of the army group, General Bradley, was arrested. Having passed the required exam on Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck, the general fell asleep when he was ordered to name the capital of Illinois. More precisely, the general called it correctly: "Springfield", but the checking sergeant heard only about the largest city of Illinois and was sure that "Chicago is the correct answer"...

"General Bradley was arrested and taken to the headquarters of the American army for interrogation."

We add that in that military-nervous situation, the general would most likely have simply been shot dead if he had made at least some sudden movement, dictated, by the way, by the natural wounding of both the military leader and the expert on American geography too ...

Moral: knowledge that pulls an individual out of the circle in which the action is performed (albeit resembling a medieval "hunting for unicorns") is unnecessary and dangerous.

"SCIENTISTS - MILITARY"

A note of very characteristic regret sounded for the first time at the Pugwash Conference back in the early 1960s, and then repeatedly echoed in the speeches of scientists, humanists

279

stov, and then in books and films on relevant topics: "We preached so much about peace and humanity, but the threat of a world thermonuclear war was defeated by the simple and cold calculations of the generals! It was their calculations of possible losses that pushed the war back."

Reference. The Pugwash Movement of Scientists (English Rir\maz\$N Sohegepse\$ op sepse ap \Nopa Ayaiz) is a movement of scientists advocating for peace, disarmament and international security, for the prevention of world thermonuclear war and scientific cooperation. The Pugwash movement was born in 1955, when [1 world famous scientists, including A. Einstein, F. Joliot Curie, B. Russell, M. Born, P. W. Bridgman, L. Infeld, L. Pauling, J. Rotblat, issued a manifesto in which they called for a conference against the use of nuclear energy in

military purposes.

In 1987, the International Student and Youth Pugwash Movement was created.

To disseminate the ideas of the Pugwash movement participants, periodicals are published: "Proseedtrz o {Ne Rir\mazi Soshegepse\$ op \$\$sepse apa \\\yoy 4 AyYagz" (annually since 1957), "Rie\umazN Me\m\$ eNeg (quarterly since 1963), Rir\mazN Ossazup! Rareg\$" (quarterly since 2000).

I don't know whether the award of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1995 sweetened the resentment of the Pugwash scientists, but this antithesis was fully formed: the values of humanism and the calculations of the General Staff. And a comparison of their effectiveness in preventing the "Great War". And "victory is obvious" - the General Staff Estimators.

But if you think a little, if you ignore class solidarity, confrontation "intellectuals – military", it turns out that even this way of achieving a result (preventing a world nuclear war) is still evidence of the well-known intellectual sophistication of the 20th century. . Half a century of peace has lasted, in fact, on a good imagination, on the ability to imagine the invisible, to believe without putting your fingers into wounds.

Mentally applying virtual pictures of the ruins to Moscow, New York, Leningrad, Magnitogorsk, Chicago, Los Angeles... the General Staff officers re-read the Gospel, where the Savior says to the Apostle Thomas: "You believed because you saw ... blessed are those who have not seen and believed ... "

They may object - quite accurate calculations of experts, calculations of megaton

280

charges, possible losses, and somewhere in the margins of these memos, geostrategic formulations were born: "unacceptable losses", "causing unacceptable damage to the enemy". |

But even from this side we will again come to such substances as "imagination", "faith". After all, even the most detailed report, with calculations and formulas, placed on the table, leaves the table owner with the final choice: to believe in these calculations or not. And in most cases, alternative calculations and memorandums lay on the same tables. It was one of the main tasks of the decision makers to ensure that several expert opinions came in.

Why, almost every known historical point of fork in the road, where states, armies seem to have had a choice (nowadays a popular term: "points of bifurcation"), where they seem to have stopped and then already went to collapse, a major historical catastrophe. And almost always near these points there were their own warnings, in ancient times - prophesying, and later, in the rational era, laying out "accurate calculations" (who were not believed).

And what kind of damage the enemy considers unacceptable for himself is also a matter of imagination to a certain extent...

And John Lennon, the author of the famous song - an informal anthem of the pacifist movement: [to dad ("Imagine a world WITHOUT wars ..."), he hit the mark, although, as they say, "exactly the opposite". It was a good ability to imagine the war that allowed this "military" still not to press the button. Here is a logical link with the chapter "So what do we do with this Victory?" from the first part of the book. It is only necessary to clarify that the word "military" is used here in a broad sense. The retired American commander-in-chief in World War II, Eisenhower, remained a "military man" in his two presidential terms. That is why he ended the war in Korea, did not allow himself to be involved in a war with Nasser's Egypt (on the contrary, he exerted restraining pressure on Great Britain, France, Israel, earning the United States the prestige of a peacemaker in the Arab world for one decade).

But L.I. Brezhnev, even though four times a Hero, a marshal who wrote himself into Zhukov's memoirs, he just wasn't a "military". (On the essence of the Brezhnev-Chernenkov estate -

281

in the chapter "War and Justice".) That's why I pressed the "Afghan button".

At the same time, I would not want to idealize Eisenhower, who in Guatemala contributed to the overthrow of President Jacobo Arbens, who intervened in Lebanon and sent the famous C-2 reconnaissance aircraft in 1960 (only to Sverdlovsk!) And in all Soviet publications it is written down as "Eisenhower is an active supporter of the Cold War".

BUT... it was his involvement in the catharsis of the Second World War that allowed him to conduct this "cold war" correctly, adequately. To comprehend the true rules of this war: not to let your country lose and not to fall into a "hot" war. That's why he ended Truman's Korean War, but also "didn't let go" of Guatemala.

Brezhnev is... Needless to say! However, in the mentioned chapter "War and Justice", I also outlined a real alternative to him, a real war hero. Pyotr Masherov is a missed chance for the Soviet Union.

Rb. Well, and a peculiar, symbolic loop of this fragment about the relationship "Scientists - the military" during the "cold war" of the USSR-USA. Granddaughter of the President - "military"

Eisenhower became the wife of the famous Soviet scientist Roald Sagdeev.

Having compared the laws of the Cold War at the beginning of this chapter with the "an equation with an unknown number of unknowns," I may now briefly go over these unknown.

Or say variable.

]. The required imagination is of quite a high level. The Cold War did have a significant imaginary component, and these partial equations of fear have been discussed above.

Though I have to admit, "imagination" isn't the best word. Maybe tarlpe? (We seem to have already established the Imagists, the image.) The word [paste has, as they used to say, "a suitable origin." Etymologically ascending, as you know, through "magic", "magicians" to the Hindu "Maya" ("mirror of the world", illusions are the reasons for the eternal variability of existence).

282

2. "Theaters of War" Cold War. Here are a few well-known, established then names of the spheres where this war was mainly waged: "Arms market", "Economic competition", "Local conflicts", "Ideological confrontation", "Propaganda".

3. The close connection between the "arms race" and "economic competition" is clear: the economy generated armaments. But the United States has succeeded in foisting on us yet another "race" whose significance for the outcome of the Cold War is greatly underestimated: the "consumption race."

4. The USSR did not lose the arms race, perhaps even those who claim that the USSR was close to winning THIS RACE are right.

5. But the USSR lost the consumption race. The standard of living in the USSR became unacceptable for a new generation of citizens.

What testifies to the "racing" nature, the competitiveness of consumption? That is, its inclusion in the general competition "USSR - USA". The fact is that for the first time in the history of Russia, the USSR, citizens began to compare their semi-intuitively generalized standard of living NOT with that of their predecessors, but with the standard of living of their contemporaries, but in other countries.

Another fact is that until the early 1980s, the USSR ensured a continuous rise in this level. (Resettled communal apartments and barracks. Household appliances ...) BUT ... now (and, in general, for the first time in history) citizens did not say "We are better than our fathers, grandfathers", but "We are worse, than Europeans, Americans.

This, most likely, also speaks of an ideological defeat.

BUT... The consumption race, the victorious weapon of the USA, did not end with their victory over the USSR. This is a very important consequence. Even the current 2008-2009 global crisis is rightly interpreted as excessive consumption in the United States. Standards imposed by advertising: a continuous change of housing, cars, household appliances - for the last money (the level of savings of many segments of US citizens has been reset to zero by the "millennium", which simply shocks economists).

283

And, having passed the "zero level", they continued to consume, already on credit, which, in fact, became the main, initial cause of the global crisis.

And the most important observation that links both parts of this book. Proof of invariance, a kind of World War II and Cold War. After all, it is not because of this once newspaper stamp under the picture (probably by Kukryniksov or Efimov): "Cold War", they, these two wars, are brought together in my book.

Symptomatically important seemed to me total criticism - even by Europeans! — "Americans snickering on credit." After all, their, Americans, consumption was in a certain degree imposed, "racing".

"You are an American locksmith—show how much better you live than a Soviet locksmith!" A farmer is better than a collective farmer. And (not the last point) an American lieutenant is better than a Soviet lieutenant...

So, we can partly recognize these Americans as soldiers, veterans of the Cold War. It was just that the combat mission was to consume.

And what is this Western European criticism of the "victorious Americans" similar to? That's right, with Eastern European criticism of the "Soviet victors", already real soldiers, from a real war.

All this is the inexorable action of the fundamental postulate of Augustine of the Blessed about the "mass of sin" (tazza ressa {}). "Original sin plus the conditions of our worldly life constantly lead to an increase in the mass of sin", "rex (the mass of sin) is not overcome by any bunch of good deeds, but only by the Grace of God."

This is the most important conclusion of the books and, in general, of "Augustine's system, which determined the consciousness and cultural image of European man for a millennium."

However, I am repeating my arguments from Chapter 19. "So what should we do with this Victory?!", where I, with the help of this first psychologist in the history of mankind, refute the ideas of Victor Pravdyuk's documentary "World War II. Russian version".

Inevitably, any actions, including those of the victors in wars, lead to their growth - the "mass of sin." Moreover,

284

the winner has to act more than others, and therefore, to increase the "mass of sin". Which is NOT overcome by good deeds, in particular by the benefits of the victory achieved.

That is why the film criticized by me was wrong, suggesting "to entrust the Nuremberg trials to neutrals>".

The Europeans, it turns out, treated the Soviet victors in World War II in the same way and the Americans in the Cold War. Archetype... Trojan victors return, someone, like Agamemnon, is killed, someone, like Odysseus, sees that he has returned as if to another house, to another country.

I remember in a review of my book "World War II. Reloaded" some critics, such as Viktor Toporov in the St. Petersburg Journal, noted that I took up arms against Clausewitz for his postulate "War is the continuation of politics by other means", indeed, in my opinion, naive to the point of idiocy. Yes, I guess it is. And the fact that the war itself takes command, that the War is a new reality, I have collected a huge number of confirmations (Bruce Catton, Martin van Creveld...). Probably, this thought has occupied me for a very long time - I remembered that in one of my, in fact, fiction books, about twenty years ago ("Bartimaeus the Eyewitness"), one of the characters, a war veteran, makes a speech on May 9th. A provincial town, flowers, schoolchildren, a tribune ... approximately - on the 35th anniversary of the Victory. And the hero suddenly blurts out: "... we saved the country. But it was a different country."

In the trenches, souls are warmed by pre-war photographs. But no, the most brilliant, crushing victory will return the pre-war world.

And the responsibility for this new world is the real reparations that the winner pays...

EXPERTS AND MYSTERIORS

I intend to confirm some of the provisions of my book, giving thoughts, arguments, fragments of the work of people who, at first glance, cannot be united into any "Areopagus", "college of priests-interpreters", in general into any organization. , caste. Scientists, outstanding admins

285

strators, church hierarchs, writers... The only thing that brings them together and distinguishes them from the multitude of their other colleagues is that at certain moments they were carriers of Knowledge among carriers of Opinions.

With someone I had a chance to communicate personally, with someone - studying their works. Some of them are quite famous, others deserve much more fame.

The first from this list will be the examination (or prophecy) of Prince Vladimir Mikhailovich Golitsyn: "Fortune-telling of the fate of the USSR". In 1931, he predicted what would happen to the USSR with amazing accuracy.

Prince Vladimir Mikhailovich Golitsyn is the most successful mayor in the history of Moscow. The Moscow governor, and then three times the head of Moscow (an elected position similar to the current mayor), who literally "dragged" Moscow into the 20th century.

For many years I have been writing about representatives of this unusually talented family, and in 2002 the great-grandson of the Moscow mayor, Mikhail Vladimirovich Golitsyn, professor at Moscow State University, academician and one of the greatest modern geologists, author of the encyclopedia Coal of Russia, gave me this "Prediction.. ." of his great-grandfather. I first published it in the magazine "My Moscow", in 2003, then in the "Literaturnaya Gazeta". In a series of responses and reprints, the Novaya Nedelya magazine was remembered: launching their pilot issue, they preceded this article with a dashing announcement on the title page: "Luzhkov is a good mayor. But they were even better!"

In general, I can't wait to post that "Fortune-telling of the USSR" of 1931, but a small digression will be a necessary "positioning" of its author.

PRINCE VLADIMIR MIKHAILOVICH GOLITSYN

There was such a famous example of an unsuccessful forecast issued in the middle of the 13th century: "In eighty years the streets of all world capitals: London, Paris, St. Petersburg, Vienna, Moscow – will be covered with a layer of horse manure half a meter thick." Accurately predicting the growth of population, industry, transportation, the number of horses was calculated, etc. Moscow, in contrast to

286

example, from the carefully planned St. Petersburg, was the most difficult testing ground for the industrial revolution at the turn of the nineteenth-twentieth centuries. But without that reform, the city in the modern concept simply would not exist. How today's Moscow, without the metro and three transport rings, would only become a city-museum, concrete Kizhi...

The city entered the new era under the long-term leadership of Prince Vladimir Mikhailovich [Olitsyn — the governor, then the Moscow mayor. It was extremely rare that pre-revolutionary Moscow gave the title of honorary citizen of the city, it was a very special statute

petitions, resolutions and then - the highest approval. Vladimir Mikhailovich Golitsyn was one of the twelve honorary citizens of Moscow.

He was born in 1847 in Paris. The high position of his parents brought young Vladimir acquaintance with many famous people. Among the guests of the family, he remembered Metropolitan Philaret, Nicholas 1, Bismarck and Wilhelm [. He sat on the lap of Pushkin's widow, Natalya Nikolaevna, when she treated him to ice cream and sweets. His Russian teacher was Shevyrev.

Seventy years later, these childhood impressions and a phenomenal memory will bring him an unexpected and only income. After the revolution, by order of Bonch-Bruевич, he received old photographs from the state archives and painted: who is who.

In 1869 he graduated with a Ph.D. from the Natural History Faculty of the Imperial Moscow University. He began his service in the Moscow City Administrative Duma as a collegiate secretary (10th grade in the ranking table).

In 1883, Prince Golitsyn became the acting vice-governor of Moscow. Awarded for participation in the organization of the consecration of the Cathedral of Christ the Savior and the coronation of Alexander Sh. Since 1887, the Moscow governor.

One of the main merits of Vladimir Mikhailovich Golitsyn to Moscow is "fitting" a new infrastructure into a long-established city. Were built:

the first Moscow power plant (1886) on Raushskaya embankment, Georgievskaya power plant (1888);

four new stations: Kursky, Paveletsky, Vindavsky (Rizhsky), Savelovsky;

287

50 artesian wells in the city, Rublevsky water intake facilities;

the first treatment facilities (5.4 thousand m³/day), the first telephone exchange.

It seems that a simple thing is a tram ... But the whole city was "dismantled" into the routes of separate "horses" owned by many private individuals. Based on the experience of privatizations / deprivatizations of the most recent years, you can imagine how conflicting the matter was. In a few years, the city bought the rights to operate the "horse" and replaced it with a tram. Under the prince, the city government also accepted the Metropolitan project. Implementation is planned for 1914-1920. The first line was "from Sokolniki to the Park" - do you recognize it? The designers of the thirties did not start from scratch.

After the revolution, he was arrested. Having learned that the new Moscow head, the third or fourth person in the rating of the CPSU (b), Lev Kamenev called Golitsyn. A kind of "barter" for a master class on managing Moscow was a "protective certificate", which Kamenev endorsed from other members of the Politburo. After these figures caught up with their fate in the 1930s, the piece of paper, on the contrary, became a dangerous bouquet of autographs from "enemies of the people," and it was burned.

It seems that the idea of the "one hundred and first kilometer" gradually matured in the Bolshevik leadership... In 1929, the Golitsyns were deprived of ration cards and expelled from Moscow to the Khlebnikovo station of the Savelovskaya railway. In 1931, as the "class struggle intensified", they asked to move even further.

Four generations of the Golitsyns settled in a small house in the town of Dmitrov near Moscow. Thus, amid persecution, he lived for 15 "Soviet" years, publishing scientific works on botany, translating scientific and literary texts from French. Shortly before reaching the age of 86, he died, leaving this document.

PREDICTION (FRAGMENT)

..On the other hand, the fact that the regime is a negative value is evident from the fact that it did not create anything to replace the destroyed, but destroyed property

288

land and stocks, private trade, broad industry... The collectivization of agriculture, trade and production is not in a position to replace what no longer exists... All this has undermined, if not even broken, all the foundations of the social system, which cannot be replaced by any proletariat, no matter what communist ideas this latter may be animated by.

... Therefore, his fall will be followed by the force of inertia, and not under the blows of a thunderstorm or in the gusts of a storm, but somehow by itself, by its own weight, i.e. unsuitability for the real world around him, his atmosphere, his conditions. And that the fall will take place sooner or later, of this I do not doubt for a minute.

Personally, I think that a dictatorship will arise, but not a collective one, as the artificially formed proletariat now claims, but a dictatorship of the individual, like Napoleon's after his victories in Italy and Egypt. But something I do not believe in the emergence of a genius from our Russian nature, wild, flabby, ignorant.

As far as our state is concerned, the following factors seem to me inevitable: the capture of Petrograd by the Finns, the incorporation of the Right-Bank Ukraine into Poland, the capture of Odessa by Poland. Independence of the former Cossack region - Don, Yuuban, Astrakhan, falling away of the Asian regions, once forcibly conquered by Russia. This is my prediction for the more or less near future...

But at that time, neither the most famous Western intellectuals, nor entire scientific corporations had any doubts about the victory of communism - the more interesting is the view of the outstanding Russian administrator.

Edit, removing this ... the capture of Petrograd by the Finnish, I specifically did not, but selected a fragment that is most closely related to the topic of the chapter.

... The fall ... by itself, by its own weight (some kind of in 1931, in many respects, had yet to be gained)! After all, factories, power plants, ports, military bases, new clans had yet to be built.

289

troops, cities, bridges, printing houses, television towers, the world's largest party, a propaganda apparatus... in general, everything that fell of itself, of its own weight - after 60 years!

And even this point ... unsuitability for the real world around him, his atmosphere, his conditions.

It was predicted, you see, the main thing is that the fall is not in a war, like World War II, but precisely during life in this rapidly changing world, during what is called the "cold war".

Chapter 3

ABOUT RUSSIAN WARS, INSTINCTS, RULERS, ROADS...

In the recently published book "Extremes of the Slavs and the Crash Test of Ukraine" (published by EKSMO-Yauza, it was published in the series "10 Myths about..."), referring to the history of the joint, separate,

again joint and again different state life of Ukrainians and Russians, I asked myself some questions, including this one: why during the years of the Great Troubles - fifty years as the annexed Volga region goes together "for Moscow", and Severskaya Ukraine - with "centenary Russian experience" - just as amicably against.

The Seversk Ukraine and the Verkhovsky Principalities, a huge region annexed in 1500, under Ivan the Third, became the main base of all impostors and Polish interventionists...

Unfortunately, in all the battles, campaigns, wars of Russian history — from the campaign of Dmitry Donskoy (the owner of a territory about one and a half the size of the current Moscow regions) and up to the First World War inclusive — how the labels of tsars, commanders, notes ("won / lost"), so they shuffle thoughtlessly. You read volumes of our stories (especially those of the belligerent and gallant 18th century) — and you get the feeling that if you add a couple of love affairs, a dressing scene, and a ready-made script for some... "Palace Revolution Secrets" or "Midshipmen"...

290

A new and useful classification of all Russian wars would be something like this.

I. Wars inside Ulus Dzhuchiev. _

Features: frequent, easy, instant conquests - or rather, the establishment of their rulers. The same Kazan - BEFORE Ivan the Terrible: several times became "Moscow" and even sent troops on general campaigns (Shig-Aley) ... Or another example: 800 "Ermakovites" who took Siberia. A well-known story, but all the resistance there rested on the heir of the blind Kuchum - Makhmetkul. And after the removal of Kuchum ... Makhmetkul - six months later (!) in the Moscow army: "the first governor of the regiment of the left hand" in the Swedish campaign!

Outcome: change of dynasties, Genghisides - to Rurikovich.

Today's result: Russia is not a conqueror, but a legitimate heir... including the Volga region, the Urals, and Siberia.

2. Wars to restore the Old Russian perimeter.

Lithuanian and Polish

Features: the acquired territories had different periods of other civilizational existence.

But: a) a single Orthodox faith,

6) some Turkic component in the Cossack quasi-state on the territory of Lithuanian Rus ensured "complementarity" - mutual attraction and subsequent gradual rallying of parts of the Old Russian heritage.

3. Inherited wars. Swedish and Turkish

Features: Swedish - inherited by Russia from pre-Mongol Rus directly and directly.

Turkish - a legacy of the old southern wars (Pechenegs, Polovtsy) through:

a) the Crimean Khan, crushed, "taken into balance" by Turkey;

6) Constantinople (the ancient point of Slavic robbery, but also the "entry point" to the Orthodox world), which became Istanbul.

4. "Big Wars". "World", which reached Russia, transformed on our soils into Patriotic or - Civil.

291

In the book "World War II. Reboot" I considered this category.

He also formulated a definition:

"The "Great War" is one where the main postulate of Clausewitz ceases to operate ("War is the continuation of politics by other means")... And the world has already formed a whole pool of historians based precisely on the denial of Clausewitz. Martin van Creveld (Mat yap Creye4), Bruce Catton, John Keegan (Choip Keerup), Russell Wiggley (Wize! Velotey), whose main postulate is "... the war, having begun, generates its own policy." This justifies the allocation of a separate category of "Great Wars".

5. Other wars, "imitative", European "image".

Italy - Switzerland - 1799, Austria - 1805, Prussia - 1807, France - 1814, Hungary - 1848, Manchuria - 1904 ...

Note: the wars for the complete subjugation of Poland, the transition "across the San River" - an important milestone from the ancient Russian folk "geopolitical" proverb ("Know, dear, according to San - ours"), these wars of 1768, 1794, 1830, 1863, on the uni - the destruction of Polish statehood is not a continuation of the wars of the 2nd category, NOT the restoration of the ancient Russian perimeter. This is a significant geopolitical excess.

This dangerous trend of excess is perfectly illustrated by the Livonian War. One of the main disputes between Ivan the Terrible and the elected Rada was the direction of further efforts after the annexation of the Volga region. The Rada was in favor of a campaign against the Crimea, Ivan chose Livonia. We fought against the Livonians and their predecessors, the Teutonic Order, BUT the question of destroying the order was never raised. Actions here for centuries were strictly reduced to a "pendulum": Derpt-Pskov, 520-100 km - on both sides of the border. For the first time, Grozny "raised the stakes": the destruction of the order, the annexation of all its lands began with major military successes, faced a coalition (the first coalition against Russia in history!) and lost big. He complained, like a child, to the German emperor about the "evil Obatur" - Stefan Batory, who mercilessly crossed out all the royal plans, took Livonia and invaded Russia.

292

Conclusion. The first three categories are "legitimate wars", understandable to the people. Conservatism, as a feature of our continental mentality (yes, we are residents of the "Heartland" with all the organic pluses and minuses of this geopolitical fact), did not allow us the luxury of Atlantic-type wars: mobile, with easy, quick change of strike directions And allies.

The wars that open their category (chronologically the first ones in it) - those about which you cannot say "usual business", as well as the wars of the 5th category, were mostly unsuccessful. Stress, helplessness, panic in unfamiliar circumstances. As in the first "imitation" of the colonial wars of the Atlantic powers: Manchuria-1904.

Moreover, an army that was formed on "habitual wars", accumulated experience and potential in them, raised commanders, could achieve any success even in "imitative", "impromptu" wars! The Seven Years' War, the Italian campaign of 1799, Hungary-1848, Afghanistan-1980... but then... the diplomatic, geopolitical frame turned any military victories into national failures. Even a formally "draw" result, correlating in the national consciousness with costs, losses, turned into a loss. There is a well-known example of the Seven Years' War, which ended with a gallant waltz with yesterday's enemy, a waltz, you can

say, "on the bones" of tens of thousands of victims, who in a single moment became unnecessary. But now it is important for us to keep in mind that it was from the Seven Years' War that the Cossack of Chernyshov's division returned home - Emelyan Pugachev ... the future, etc. ...

True, later he, Pugachev, still had a short "business trip" in 1768 to Poland (search for and return to Russia of the escaped Old Believers), but that country in that year (the year already considered the year of the suppression of the Gonta uprising) could only strengthen his impression some gap, "non-nationality", senselessness of state efforts ...

And the fact that such "Atlantic", amphibious... distant (one can call it by analogy with distance learning) wars is not about our honor... Yes, even compare the results of the Vietnam War and the same Afghan war. (Where is water off the duck, and where is the collapse of the state.)

293

This classification of Russian wars, proposed by me, of course, somewhat leads away from the main theme of the book. However, this proposed "Periodic Table of Russian Wars" in its own way illustrates the mechanics of the annexation of territories, explains the different strength of these annexations, occurrences. And in particular:

— why... fifty years since the annexed Volga region has been marching in unison "for Moscow", while Seversk Ukraine – with "a hundred years of Russian experience" – is just as unanimously opposed.

The Volga region is an annexation, the result of a war of the 1st category (the most legitimate annexation, understandable to both sides, annexed and annexed); and Severskaya Ukraine - 2nd.

That is, the conquest in the war of the 2nd category takes much (more than twice) longer to incorporate than the conquest in the war of the 1st category.

More clearly this "table" explains the impasses of Russian politics.

A series of wars of the 2nd category reunited Russia-Ukraine.

But thoughtless games to conquer native Poland (1830, 1863), that is, the classic wars of the 5th category, they gave rise to the very "Ukrainian nationalism" that worked a century later. Here it is not possible to devote enough space to the evidence of this fact, I have collected them just in the book "Extremes of Slavism and the Crash Test of Ukraine", but the conclusion, believe me, is the following: "secondary Ukrainization of Ukraine", the formation of a layer, a group of people, suddenly again (200 years later) who felt like a separate Ukrainian people — this is all of the 20th century and the result of attempts to fully include Poland in the body of the Russian Empire.

And as for the period of the wars of Bogdan Khmelnytsky and their assessment by historians like Ulyanov (he already accuses Bogdan of the first separatism, betrayal of Russia), these illusions, this "demanding look from the 10th-20th centuries" of them is precisely explained historical aberration. Impressed by the pseudo-successes of the 20th century, the meaningless results of "imitative wars," they frivolously project their demands onto the 17th century as well.

294

Our "inflexibles" deliver a verdict: "So, according to Buturlin's report, did we ever have the Pereyaslav Rada, in 1654? So, in 1655, a Ukrainian should be the same as a Muscovite, Yaroslavl, Nizhny Novgorod!" You can order, you can send it with a wave of the "sovereign hand" anywhere. This is very similar to the line of the kings of Alexander, Nicholas: the rapture of power, which is just at this time and melts. ("Dizzy with success," someone in the mid-20th century would add.)

BUT it is characteristic that the then, 17th century, Moscow government, with the "instinct of 1612" still alive, with a good memory of the recent collapse (and some of its causes!), it did not allow itself to become intoxicated with power. Treated with the first hetmans extremely kindly and patiently.

After all, the Russian army then was, in comparison with the 18th century, simply no! These archers (every dispatch from Moscow is a riot). This local cavalry, inferior in collisions | in 1 Crimean Tatar and Polish. The well-known defeat of the 40,000-strong Russian army by the Crimean Cossacks near Konotop. (And the post-Petrine armies were already calmly crushing 8-10-fold superior Tatars, Poles, Turks.)

But state diplomatic, geopolitical wisdom, popular approval and participation ("the instinct of 1612") turned out to be more important in 1654 than direct military force! And more efficient.

"I'll take everyone with my people, our tsar spoke in Congress."

Or there is Pavel - he wanted to and became the Grand Master of the Knights of Malta! At the same time, it was seriously considered (oh, idiocy!), That thereby, as it were, the island of Malta was already annexed!

No wonder Saltykov-Shchedrin calls the allegorical capital of Nikolaev Russia "Neprklonsk"! The correct formula was developed under Nicholas: "Autocracy, Orthodoxy, nationality." And the crazy trip to Hungary in 1848? Salvation by the Russian people's blood of the Habsburgs, the worst suppressors of Orthodoxy! (I think that the year 1848 will be assessed by the Serbs in the same way as the Hungarians!) But it turned out just right: autocracy is against Orthodoxy and nationality!

But, generally speaking, royal responsibility is not a very controversial thing. The king is responsible before God, and here even such a clumsy, impromptu aphorism will be true:

295

"If you believe in God, then you will see how Alexander and his brothers Nicholas and Constantine report to Him. And if you DO NOT believe... then what can you talk about with you at all?!"

ABOUT HOBBY AND INSTINCT

Think about it... very fond of people were the kings of the Romanov dynasty. Almost the most important cross-cutting feature. Aleksey Mikhailovich annexed half of Ukraine, and already he felt like the ruler of all the southern Orthodox peoples. Getting ready! This is the reason for the split. They explained to him that all his subjects, Ukrainians, Vlachs, Moldavians, Bulgarians, without five minutes ... are baptized with three fingers and serve according to the books of such and such. And Russia urgently needs to reform under future subjects - Nikon will tell you how. That is why they say that in the ecclesiastical and ritual sense, it was Ukraine that annexed Russia to itself...

Alexander the First and Konstantin were carried away by the Poles,

Peter - Holland and the North German principalities. Pavel is truly a "candle in the wind", probably the most enthusiastic – you can't even list what exactly. His

Malta and a trip to India are just touches.

And Nicholas the First was carried away by "Euro-monarchist solidarity", and even in the transcription of ... the criminal scoundrel Nesselrode.

Actually, only Alexander the Third was fascinated by Russia...

Just don't take this list as some kind of anti-monarchist quotation book, where almost all the tsars are ready for claims. All these monarchs loved Russia as themselves, moreover, in a certain sense and at a certain time they were Russia itself - here all the volumes of panegyric literature are right in their own way. And their "scattering" - this is

"scattering" the country itself, part of the energy, that, thank God, cannot be taken away, which nevertheless directs it to internal growth, and the other part, not bound by the instinct of growth and self-preservation, which directed ... it is difficult and to list where only to not directing! Unless they discovered Antarctica, how

296

once, by the way, in the Alexander era, they discovered ... and forgot. But this would be a more worthy and fruitful point of application of forces. Much more grateful than their "Holy Union", Poland and the Balkans... It would also be a good geographical and climatic addition to the most popular (at least the most widely disseminated) thought of Konstantin Leontiev: "Russia needs to be frozen".

Well, if without geopolitical grievances and annoyances, then we can sum it up: the reigns and periods were favorable and successful when Russia was ruled by instincts: self-preservation and growth... , governments, but ruled at the same time, following the dictates of instinct.

I proposed the name of the political line that saved and raised the country from the very bottom...

"INSTINCT OF 1812"

Both 1812 and 1941-1943 are examples of the operation of this instinct that unites the country.

It is difficult for the second, the growth instinct, to find a specific name, but it is possible to offer an image: the child sleeps 23 hours a day and grows, grows. Most of the energy goes into growth. And imagine here smart teachers with their initiatives: "Let's not let him sleep. Let's take him to some useful lectures, classes.

After all, they seem to see the objective, visible on all maps, the uniqueness of the case of Russia, but they cannot refuse their ... Luxembourg templates and standards.

And "forces going to growth" is not an abstraction. For example, the "man-days" and money spent on a trip to Hungary in 1848 (actually a trip to save Metternich, even terribly to think about) would be enough to reach the railway not only to Tsarskoye Selo and Moscow, but also to the Black Sea. After that, it would be simply impossible to lose the Crimean War.

Reference. The first railway in the Crimea.

It was built by the landing British. From Balaklava (their supply port) to the outskirts of Sevastopol. She played a huge role in supplying the Allied armies besieging Sevastopol.

297

But if it, the "Crimean War", was not started, it would be possible to have time to master the Amur Region - and then it would really not give up Alaska ... and so on.

We like to remember Alaska, the topic is really the most popular, right up to pop songs, "Alaskan suffering". But they do not remember that when Alaska was given away, the first 40 people were just landing on the site of the future Vladivostok! But without the Amur Territory and Primorye, access to the Pacific Ocean hung on several Yakut hunting paths. [just look at the map, in fact - a geographical and geopolitical incident. The paths stretched across all the rivers of the Lena basin, mountain ranges and went to Okhotsk, which to this day looks like an isolated "fort" - a monument to the unsupported heroism of the pioneers. And until the middle of the 20th century, the cargo flow to Alaska was more reliable, more voluminous - through round-the-world sea expeditions. Of course, this could not go on for long.

Strict - do not go round - choice. Or or. Or show off in Europe, or build roads in Siberia. There is also an internal political dimension to this dilemma. Sociologists call unemployment in the countryside "hidden", overpopulation - "hidden overpopulation". Agricultural employment is a more elastic concept, and a village can accommodate more and more people. But after reaching a certain coefficient of overpopulation, an explosion becomes inevitable - as in France by Louis XIV or in Russia by Nicholas P. The only difference is that in Russia this "theorem" could be solved if there were ... right - all the same roads.

Chapter 4 "RUS-GARTEN"

("about the cordon sanitaire", "Euro-orderlies" and one stubbornly surviving "patient")

The second most important factor in the stability of the state body, in addition to the road skeleton, is natural boundaries. The theme of "natural borders" has become practically the main one in the political

298

disputes since the 18th century. The seas were considered the most important of the natural boundaries, and, accordingly, "access to the sea" - the most natural movement of continental states.

Here is an example of a piercing misunderstanding of our entire tragic geopolitics. In Stockholm, not far from the Katarina-Hiessen observation tower, the guides will gladly show you a street of two-story houses - "Rus-garten", "Russian Compound". And no less joyfully photographed on it. How! The Swedes, you see, keep the memory! Thank them'..

Russian merchants really settled in these houses on the Ruesgarten. The project is almost typical: the first floor - 20 square meters - is residential. The second, attic, half the size is a warehouse for goods. The era of the emergence of this "Russ-garten" is pre-Petrine.

Our merchants walked around the Stockholm markets... like peddlers. Ofeni. Traded with hands - small things. Today, a close analogue of their nomenclature is in these obscene "Intourist" stalls: nesting dolls, soldier's hats, T-shirts with stupid inscriptions. Souvenirs.

And all the more or less serious batches of classic "flax, hemp, tar, bread, wax" were bought in Russia by Swedish merchants, the owners of the coast, "on the vine". That's what you- born foreign trade power. In the relevant chapters of history you will also find the term "non-equivalent exchange" - about the Russian trade of the 17th century. This, by the way, is the eternal ideal of all cordon builders.

And all political correctness, and "the need for historical repentance", for example, in front of the Czech Republic, the Baltic states, Romania and other corporals of the cordon service, about whose work one can write volumes on Hitler, all this is fragments of that old ideal of theirs: "Russian farmsteads" in European capitals and Russian peddlers with matryoshkas on the streets ...

In general, I confess, with a heavy gaze I followed the flocks of our tourists, joyfully "taking pictures" with the guides on that Ruesgarten ...

In general, "cutting a window into Europe" meant not only conquering so many miles of the Baltic coast, but also creating infrastructure, without which these miles would remain only beaches with very cool sand and water.

299

My students, in general, exactly repeat different history textbooks: "Ivan the Terrible started the Livonian War - for access to the Baltic Sea." To clarify: Ivan Gfozny already had access to the sea, from the mouth of the Neva to the mouth of the Narova - the famous Vodskaya Pyatina (by the way, exactly the same as the USSR had before 1940). There were no ports. Having received Narva on May 11, 1558, Ivan the Terrible opened a real maritime trade for as many as 23 - even military - years, from

hundreds of visiting ships. True, in the end he lost both Narva and the original Vodskaya Pyatina. By the way, Boris Godunov had a quite successful, albeit little-known war with the Swedes, and he returned the coast lost by Ivan the Terrible! But I did not have time to equip, and then - impostors, turmoil and the Swedes who reached Novgorod ...

ONCE ON THE BALTIC

Unique Geopolitical Symmetry: The Position of the USSR in the 1930s and Russia in the 1990s. The glaring vulnerability of Leningrad, with military, merchant, and fishing fleets huddled together in the frozen shallow water ("Marquis's Puddle"), in the 1930s gave rise to the answer: "Give us a second Kronstadt!" - shock, strategic construction in the Kingiseppsky district on the Luga Bay, about 20 kilometers northeast of Ivangorod. It was there and then, at the mouth of the Luga near the village of Vistino, in the port being built at a frantic pace, that the hull of the real Aurora was flooded as a breakwater. By the way, this is one of the favorite TV spots of the founder of the popular Vzglyad program Vladimir Mukusev, who in 2008 showed me all these places in detail, and showed me a copy of his famous Vzglyad story.

In 1940, the ports of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania made Ust-Luga irrelevant, but in the 90s the "pendulum" returned to the same point. There is one important difference: the USSR built gigantic, first-class Novotallinsk and Ventspils ports in the former Soviet republics. And the newly independent Estonia and Latvia included transit revenues in their budgets. Plus, something already unthinkable for the 1930s: we have a powerful lobby. It's a thing of the past, but you can recall dozens of articles, TV shows,

300

politicians' speeches. "Building a new port is an unaffordable luxury for Russia", "A terrible blow to the environment is possible". "Cargo traffic has already been established, there are Estonian, Finnish, Latvian ports – we need to use them"... European officials "feared" that the new port would be environmentally dirty, elegantly forgetting: who, in fact, built Novotallinsky? (The one they set is an example for us.)

The first time I turned to this Baltic Knot was in 1995-1996, at an interesting time. The head of the Kingisepp district, Vadim Anatolyevich Gustov, at that time was going to be promoted, to the governorship of the Leningrad region. And two years later, Yevgeny Maksimovich Primakov himself will call him to the first vice-premier of the country. A characteristic moment - I can't help but jump ahead along the chronological ladder: when moving to vice-premiers, Vadim Gustov voiced only one personal demand: 15 million rubles of one-time assistance to Ivangorod - to close another hole in the budget of the unfortunate city, which paid for water supply in foreign currency, sewerage and more. (The entire infrastructure of the once unified city ended up in Narva, in another state.) And then the vice-mayor, then the mayor, Alexander Yuryevich Drozdenko, remained "in the district", and he told me about the difficulties of Ivangorod, the creation of a new Ust-Luga port and drawing a new Russian-Estonian border... Real drawing — not with a felt-tip pen on the globe, "three fingers to the right of Iraq", to the place of washing boots in the Indian Ocean, but painstakingly painting shreds and islands the size of .. There will be a different dacha in Zhukovka.

In 1944, the Germans left 4 (four!) surviving residents on the ruins of Narva - Ivangorod. The city was restored by citizens of the whole country, mainly from the neighboring Pskov and Novgorod regions, Belarus. Since then, the population of Narva has been 95% Russian. The new, "ethnically pure" Estonian leadership was "landed" on the city in 1992. Since then, discrimination against the Russian-speaking population of Estonia has been a fact noted, among other things, by several commissions of the Council of Europe in dozens of books, reports, and references. Non-Estonian speakers cannot hold state and municipal positions, are limited in doing business (especially if the matter is related to the acquisition of land, real estate).

301

By the way, Estonianization was also carried out in the 1920s and 1930s. Russians and even Germans (their recent masters) were forcibly assigned Estonian surnames. With the famous meticulousness of their former owners, they translated into Estonian and handed over passports: Ruchiev became Oya, Losev became Pyder. But they recorded the Zolotarevs as Auldmaa (Golden Land), ignoring the golden service with German formalism.

Today, the main discrimination is linguistic and cultural. Higher education in Russian is an opportunity for residents in 90% of the Russian-speaking north-east of Estonia are deprived. Of the 14 secondary schools in Narva, 13 are Russian-speaking, but their graduates have nowhere to continue their education. Russian-language universities are actually banned. However, is it new for us to bypass any barriers?.. There is a Modern Humanitarian Academy (SGA) in Russia, in fact, a "mega-university" that has unique telecommunications up to its satellites, through a network of branches providing high-quality higher education in Russia and on many "islands" of the Russian-speaking world. And when Estonia banned the opening of the SGA branch in Narva with 70,000 inhabitants (which, in general, was expected), it was opened in Ivangorod. 11,000 inhabitants of Ivangorod is not enough according to the calculated standards of the SGA for a branch, but, as expected, Narvians did not come here to study. Of course, this is a half-measure, and in general is typically Russian: "need for invention is cunning", but, what is most interesting, this is an absolutely private initiative, in fact, a business project of the SGA, somewhere on the verge of self-sufficiency. And if sometimes it is beyond the bounds, unprofitable, then the giant - "megauniversity" - supports it for sound practical reasons:

- 1) next to the 70-thousandth Russian, in fact, the city;
- 2) and the whole north-east of Estonia (Ida-Virumaa county) is an area of almost compact residence of Russian-speakers;
- 3) yes, the Estonian authorities liquidated Russian-language universities;
- 4) but to discourage the craving for education - even ten Ansips will not be enough for this;
- o) it means that the Russians will go across the river to Ivangorod to study.

302

It was Alexander Yuryevich Drozdenko, the then mayor of the strategically most important district in Russia, Kingiseppsky District, that I would invite to become an expert in... practical geopolitics.

"EXPERTS AND SPIRITUALS"

A.Yu. Drozdenko: — The working commission for describing the passage of the border (as it was correctly called) worked for 2 years. Indispensable participants: the head of the administration, the land surveyor of the district, representatives of the "power structures". The so-called numbered points are set, as a rule, along the fairway of the Narova River, then the description follows: "To the right of the "big" island, then it goes to a cape such and such ...", then docking. The difficulties lie in the position of the Estonian leadership. Their territorial claims against Russia are well known. In the Leningrad region, this is a strip of about a kilometer, capturing Ivangorod, to the village of Komarovka. They did not send their representatives, but they notified that they would take the result of this work, even redeem it.

I. Shumeiko: That is, they bought the drawing of the rejected border. Let's hope (Estonians won't spend even a penny for nothing) - we have acquired cards for serious negotiations, and the issue of borders and territorial claims will finally be closed.

Drozdenko: And in 1994, when the border was not yet guarded, "Kaistelit" – paramilitary Estonian detachments – crossed the river and set up a border post near the village of Komarovka, which instantly became famous throughout Europe. The current border, the former administrative border between the Leningrad Region and the Estonian SSR, causes many difficulties. For example, the exit from the Narova River to Lake Peipus was completely closed to us. For some reason, the water border did not go along the fairway, as usual in world practice, but exactly along the Russian coast. They pushed her to the fairway in

exchange for other lake areas. Estonians also had requests: sometimes their roads were torn apart by the border, it is expensive to lay detours. And we could give away a little territory - but strictly within the principle agreed upon in the third round of negotiations: water for water, land for earth...

303

During this time, many events have occurred, including unpleasant ones. Especially with regard to the construction of the first stage of the port - the coal terminal. Today, not understanding the significance of this port means not understanding the prospects for Russia's economic policy at all. [Germany is ready to take 17 million tons of coal annually. Last year, Russia exported 5 million tons, and mainly through the ports of Estonia and Latvia. There was information in the Estonian press that if the construction of the port in Ust-Luga does not begin in the near future, the Estonian government will take loans, primarily in Germany, and begin construction.

Shumeiko: That is, the power of the coal flow makes it possible to build a terminal, as I understand it? BUT ONE. Either there or here - the first will solve the problem, and no one will give a penny for the second.

Drozdenko: Yes. And if we want to keep the Russian coal industry as such, we need to solve the problems of transit. There was a conversation with Vadim Anatolyevich Gustov that the Germans would invest in the presence of at least a political declaration that the government would support this construction, this particular transport line. It is clear that now Russia does not have this money, and the miners do not have money. But it is possible to associate the inevitable costs of infrastructure: access railway and road, access canal, power transmission lines — with no less inevitable costs for the restructuring of the coal industry. The released part of the miners can work at these facilities.

Shumeiko: Oh, Alexander Yurievich! Spoil such a beautiful picture: the port of Tallinn is puffing all over Russia, the Ust-Luga buildings of the 1930s are covered with silt and sand, "Memorial" erects a monument to the victims there, miners barricade in mines, their families on rails and federal highways, megaphone radicals in front of the protest columns — in general, everything is in business...

Drozdenko: Yes... I perfectly understand the struggle going on around this project. The main part of transit now goes through the Baltic republics and Finland. And there is a certain powerful lobby which, so far successfully, is blocking Russia's efforts to build a coal terminal. And by the way, here's another reason. After all, the infrastructure: railway and highway,

304

the approach canal, power transmission lines will work and then, after the coal one, it will come to the oil terminal, container, grain, mineral fertilizers terminal, railway-road crossing.

In any country, the infrastructure belongs to the state, and it takes the mooring dues, the fee for the passage channel. Private investors would like to invest directly in port facilities. The fact that the port economy is profitable, we proved on the example of the forest port. In 1998, on the basis of the berths and warehouses of Lenrybholodflot in Ust-Luga, the Factor company was established, which was engaged in timber transshipment. 400,000 cubic meters were shipped in the first year, and now the owners plan to increase the volume to 1 000,000 cubic meters. But this port at the mouth of the river is designed to serve small ships of the river-sea class.

The Belgian company De Smet, which buys vegetable oils all over the world, including in the Krasnodar Territory, also wants to build a refining and bottling plant in Ust-Luga. That is, it was determined that it is more optimal to enter the territory of Russia through this port. St. Petersburg businessmen want to set up a container terminal - they have probably assessed the degree of workload and "capture" of their own port.

Now, together with the government of the Leningrad region, we are resolving the issue of granting Ust-Luga the status of an official port. This is an institution of the port administration, a customs terminal. Now the picture is as follows: the vessel is processed by us, and it goes to the port of Vysotsk (on the northern coast of the Gulf of Finland) for customs clearance/ customs clearance. This, among other things, is also the loss of a calendar period, since Vysotsk is freezing, but we are not. But the customs, the administration are there, and we... we solve the issues to the best of our ability.

Shumeiko: Yes, Alexander Yurievich. There was something like that at school. A solid English city, and people go to vote at the location of some three-century-old castle. It happens already under water - it means that they vote on boats. It was called the system of "rotten towns"... But what will a real seaport on the Luga Bay be like?

Drozdenko: After all, this is a practically non-freezing water area. That is, with regular movement in winter, the icebreaker does not

305

required. A key point for future economic growth. Our export plus - we must not forget - transit cargo. Service throughout Central Asia, China. It is important that legally now the construction of the port is not a private affair of Ilya Mikhailovich Baskin...

Note. It was a whole story associated with the purchase of coastal land, which took away some years.

And now the controlling stake belongs to the Russian government. The rest of the terminals - I think it will not be terrible if they turn out to be private terminals. In general, despite the crisis, there is such an objective phenomenon as the growth of the economy of the Kingisepp region. If in 1996-97 we were a subsidized region, in 1998 we reached zero, then in 1999 we became donors to the regional budget...

AND A POSTSCRIPT FROM THE 2000S

I remember how difficult it was for the materials about Ust-Luga to pass in 1995-1996. Who's there? What's there? The feeling that a few lone enthusiasts in the Leningrad region grappled with an international monster with the complete indifference of the whole country. It seems that they both won and were noted: the new head of the district, Alexander Drozdenko, also went on a promotion to the Leningrad Region, and the immediate project manager, Vladimir Yakunin, became the head of Russian railways. But according to the response in the public consciousness, it all looked like ... winning by ours, somewhere very, very far away, one unprincipled football match, the rights to broadcast which, in addition, were not bought out ...

Understanding comes late. In 2006, a response was needed to the actions of another veteran of the "cordon sanitary service" - Lithuania, which threatened to cut off communication with the Kaliningrad region. At the negotiations with the Lithuanians, an answer was needed - a real alternative (not some kind of airships!) to the railway, cut by the Lithuanians. St. Petersburg, turning into a song-decorative port, simply could not help in this situation. And what happened? The only real, verifiable, calculable answer: the Kaliningrad-Ust-Luga ferry line, our

306

the deepest water port in the Baltic. Its very presence deprived Lithuania of its position as a transport monopoly, and the then crisis was successfully resolved...

I am completing my geopolitical excursion to the city, the largest Russian port during the Livonian War, returning its importance to the present times.

GEVEMSRAOM AND THE GREAT (ENERGY) CARTA

The most risky chapter... In my title, I seem to be hinting at a certain one-order policy of GeBenzgait ip Osep (German for living space in the East) and this already almost notorious Energy Charter. And with this, as if once again, I compare the authors - that is, the Fuhrer and the current European Union. The difficulty is that some stereotypes have become so ingrained in the minds that many European politicians, and even our supporters of "open societies", perhaps quite sincerely consider Russia's refusal to ratify the Energy Charter as unacceptable selfishness, an attempt at pressure...

The head of the European Union (President of the European Commission) Jose Manuel Barroso: "We will not let energy resources split Europe today, as communism split it before."

Yuri Vdovin, liberal, ecologist, specialist in fair distribution of resources:

"..the ratification of the Energy Charter Treaty (ECT) has been repeatedly postponed. Enough formal reasons and reasons have been put forward, but the main thing, apparently, is that for Russia, unfortunately, energy resources are turning into the only means of maintaining itself in the form of an influential international force capable of influencing foreign consumers of energy resources due to their dependence on from our oil and gas supplies. The ratification of the ECT introduces this document into the legal framework of the Russian Federation and in many respects equalizes the partners under the agreement and weakens the possibility of an energy chance.

307

tazha (emphasis mine. - I.Sh.)... The current government does not want to know other ways to improve prosperity in the country's economy and increase its authority in the world, because this requires real, not imitation reforms in the economy, which, in turn, requires a real democratization of the country, and not a surrogate in the form of an idiotic sovereign democracy (...)"

Indeed, how can Russia be a good energy partner without drifting into energy monopolists, energy blackmailers? After all, the European Union needs to sell oil and gas, where, whether we like it or not, certain values and phobias have developed. Simply calling them stereotypes, preconceived clichés will not help matters...

Here we need an example that is really unexpected, sharply expanding the mental horizons. Back in 2005-2006, I had the opportunity to publish materials about the most, perhaps, "holy business" for Europe - alternative energy. About a powerful triumvirate: Herman Scheer, Klaus Thyssen and our Zhores Alferov, who advanced solar energy more than others. About Scheer's general idea - the creation of an analogue of the IAEA - the "International Renewable Energy Agency". Today, Hermann Scheer, founder of KEMA (Latin for International Renewable Energy Agency), receives well-deserved congratulations. The agency is working, thousands and thousands of solar panels are working...

But here's what number of the times of my work on alternative energy articles I remember most of all. It is verifiable, and generally obvious. The same solar power plant in Russia, in the most average terms, will produce 2 times less energy than in Germany.

This is the most objective indicator, the specific energy of the sun per square meter, there and there.

And more information — also at the level of literally the textbook "Natural Studies", the fifth, it seems, grade. The energy of the winds, also born from the uneven heating of the atmosphere by the sun, decreases from West to East. Therefore, in Europe, especially in Maritime Europe, it is possible to install wind farms. But to the cities of Siberia (Kyzyl, Irkutsk, Krasnoyarsk ...)

308

the prevailing Atlantic winds arrive so weak that the main problem there is smog. Even the smallest air pollution accumulates in caps over cities during weeks of calm.

The result of this - I admit - a strange digression into "Natural Science":

If we calculate more precisely (and this will need to be done!) it will turn out that Russia, in comparison with Europe, is greatly deprived of solar and wind energy. Probably two or three orders of magnitude. (There is also such a concept: extractable energy.)

But what is our oil and gas? The same solar energy, only condensed and saved for millions of years! This is the devastatingly simple conclusion that European thought has not yet reached. Here is a wonderful new field for the application of Hugo Grotius's "natural law"! Nothing prevents me from reducing the entire energy collision to the following simple analogy. Mr. X has a carton of condensed milk, and Mr. Y has a tank of whole milk. Wu says: milk is such an important, special, vital product that there should be no place for blackmail, monopoly in its possession, and therefore let's provide "equal access" to your box of condensed milk!

And Mr. X objects: "My condensed milk!" — receiving accusations of "condensed egoism", "condensed monopoly", "condensed blackmail" for this. And so the term "condensed milk" is imposed in the teeth of all the media, that everyone simply forgets (and Mr. X, unfortunately, too) that "condensed milk" is still milk. Which Mr. Wu has a tank full of.

The only trick is that the Energy Charter, in its 18th paragraph, seems to recognize "national sovereignty over natural resources." They only demand the right to buy, roughly speaking, pipes. BUT, the thrice-sovereign resources underground will be useless if the exit from this "underground storeroom" ends up in the wrong hands.

After all, Jupiter also has methane! And all its difference from the methane burning in your burner is the presence - yes! - Gazprom pipe ...

Sovereignty may well remain a trinket for the natives, remember: in the same decade of the Great Shouting of Hands, not only the ECT, but also the HRE were imposed on us

309

(Production Sharing Agreements). Sad memory "Project Sakhalin". In the era of colonialism, another memorable name corresponded to this - "concessions": The land is yours, we can poke flagpoles with your state flags every three meters, but your legislation is suspended here, get your share in kind and don't even peek through our fence. Africa, Latin America can remember a lot about the "epoch of SR".

Incidentally, this "Magna Energy Charter" was not ratified by Norway, which also owns a fair amount of hydrocarbons ("condensed milk" in our deliberately mundane, everyday example).

And if you get away from this "everyday life", then you can quite rightly say: the pipe [azprom - yes, it is a carrier of hydrocarbons, the former solar energy. But solar and wind power plants are also, in fact, carriers of solar energy.

And if you have established a rule that every second windmill, every second battery will give its electricity to Russia, then we can talk about your access to the Gazprom pipeline. In similar volumes, in terms of the same kilocalories of solar energy.

Well, Iraq, which previously had an Oil for Food program, now has an Oil for Democracy program.

But we are being offered "Gas in exchange for justice"! So is it fair to remind you of other forms of the same energy?! By the way, Norway (also, by the way, the owner of large stocks of condensed milk) will not ratify this... Magna Carta of energy liberties. But there are excuses here.

Once again - Yuri Vdovin, liberal, ecologist, specialist in a fair distribution of energy:

"This is where Russia appeals to Norway - it also does not ratify the treaty. However, there is a lot of indecent cunning here. Norway does not really ratify the treaties. But Norway is a democratic constitutional state. With old traditions. And the motivation for her attitude to the ratification of the treaty is absolutely convincing, not threatening.

310

neither democracy, nor human rights, nor market relations either in Norway itself or in the countries of the European Union. The democratically changing Norwegian governments have chosen not to ratify this document. At the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a correspondent of the newspaper Aneprozep (22 November 2006) was told that the charter opens up opportunities for private firms to enter into cooperation agreements that may be contrary to the Norwegian constitution. In other words, oil companies can use, guided by the treaty and charter, international arbitration instead of the Norwegian court. This is what may be contrary to the Norwegian constitution. But at the same time, it should be remembered that, unlike Russia, Norway is part of the EU internal market, is an equal and equally liable member of its single economic space, and, in addition, as a WTO member, Norway does not automatically contradict with its trade obligations, but completely corresponds in its activities to the ideas of the Treaty to the European Energy Charter. Therefore, formally, foreign investors are protected from possible discrimination by the Norwegian oil industry and

gas workers.

The situation with Russia is completely different. The EU is concerned that Russia is increasingly using its energy resources for political purposes, which is contrary to the main idea of the charter. In addition, the EU countries are also concerned that the extraction of energy resources in Russia is not the most environmentally sound (emphasis mine. — I.Sh.). And climate change in the world is increasingly worrying the EU community. Justified or not justified is the second question. In any case, this is precisely why the EU wants Russia to open up its energy markets to foreign companies' investments and promote the introduction of their modern and environmentally more acceptable technologies (emphasis mine. - I.Sh.) legal protection.

All this was especially noticeable during the last meeting of the EU and Russia in Lahti, in October, according to the notes made by the representative of the Spanish Foreign Ministry. These records ended up in trash cans and thus became the property of the press. According to these records, German Chancellor Ange

311

La Merkel pointed out that when Putin is reminded of the ratification of the treaty, he "turns the arrows" on Norway.

It is precisely the fact that we have not signed an agreement that can explain the "wars" on Sakhalin with TNK BP and around Kovykta. Of course, maybe the agreement with BP required correction, but the main thing is still not in this, but in the potential loss of the possibility of political pressure on consumers and business partners.

Monopoly is the essence and driving motive of the growing resuscitation of the idea of returning the status of a superpower for the current government in Russia, which lives in the traditional Soviet categories of confrontation with the democratic world. It is so sweet to remember how the world trembled in fear of the unpredictable Soviet nuclear-missile superpower! (...).".

Listened to the "expert on ecology and justice"? I have highlighted in italics another important point of the claims. Ecology is indeed closely related to energy. And retreat, following the essence of the claims expressed (not only by expert Vdovin!) will now have to go far, right up to the famous Kyoto Protocol. But it is here, in the special section of this book "Experts and Seers," that I can give the floor to a truly world-famous scientist, academician [Georgy Golitsyn.

I was fortunate enough to talk with him many times, publish about a dozen articles about him, and devote a chapter to him in my book *The Golitsyns and All Russia*. By the way, he is the great-grandson of Prince Vladimir Mikhailovich Golitsyn, whose "Expertise" on the fate of the USSR is given in the chapter "Equation with an unknown number of unknowns".

"EXPERTS AND MYSTERIES"

The leading geophysicist of the world, director of the Institute of Atmospheric Physics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician, long-term member of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Georgy Sergeevich Golitsyn is the main scientific authority in Russia on topics of both new and old threats to humanity. He was one of the UN experts, and the famous resolution on the danger of "nuclear winter" was adopted thanks, among other things, to his research. April 25, 2005 Euro

312

The Pei Union of Geosciences awarded him its highest award, the Alfred Wegener Medal. Today, the works of Georgiy Sergeevich have become especially important (global warming, the Kyoto Protocol, quotas for gas emissions, billions of dollars, etc. ...). In 2007, when President Putin presented him with an order in the Kremlin, he replied: "I serve Russia ... like all 600 years - all the generations of the Golitsyns!"

ON THE ROAD OF THE GENERAL STORYLINE. "KYOTO"

In December 1997, the "Protocol to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change" was signed in Kyoto. The Protocol enters into force upon ratification by countries whose total greenhouse gas emissions exceed 55% of the world. The main "motor" of the first ever global agreement was "old Europe", primarily England, Holland, Germany, and France.

The Kyoto Protocol determines for each country from "List No. 1" (38 industrialized countries) quotas for greenhouse gas emissions for the period 2008-2012. Russia has a quota of 100% of the 1990 emissions, or 3 billion tons per year. And the 15 states of the "old" European Union should reduce their emissions by 8% in total compared to the 1990 level. Further: due to the collapse of the industry, the actual amount of greenhouse gas emissions by Russia fell by more than 40% and currently stands at 2.1 billion tons per year.

This means that according to the Kyoto algorithm, Russia in 2008-2012 will be able to sell "surplus", emission quotas, to other countries. "Greenhouse" "enemies" in Kyoto recognized 6 gases, the main of which, of course, carbon dioxide.

Since 2007, the European Union has officially operated a trading system for emissions of carbon dioxide (and five other "greenhouse" gases). For 12,000 enterprises, quotas have been set, in case of excess - a fine (or the purchase of a certificate for additional emissions from those who emitted less than they had the right to). Russia needs to create emission accounting systems, mechanisms for trading "surpluses".

313

And finally, prices. The whole country is monitoring the price of an oil "barrel", and soon, perhaps, we will be monitoring the price of "carbon dioxide". Now it is \$10-13 per ton. There are a lot of expert forecasts of price movements, just like for oil: both a decrease and an increase are predicted... up to \$20 per ton. That is our

"carbon dioxide" income, in the case of correct and evidence-based measurements - from 5 to 100 billion dollars.

- Georgy Sergeevich, after all, under the Kyoto Protocol, the Presidential Administration also addressed you ...

- Strictly speaking, we gave an expert opinion on the forecast of the director of the Institute for Economic Analysis of the Academy of Sciences Illarionov, a well-known opponent of the Kyoto Protocol.

- So you are for "Kyoto" or Illarionov? Is warming a natural cycle or human fault?

- I can only talk about the scientific and prognostic part of this issue. All serious mathematical models of the behavior of the Earth's atmosphere cannot explain the warming of recent decades without taking into account man-caused factors... The natural cycle? To date, no cycles, except for the annual one, have been identified on Earth. With the exception of the cycles of solar activity, the quasi-two-year internal cycle and associated with El Niño, these are cycles of four, six, seven years. There are no other pronounced cycles, all the observed changes are somehow connected with human activity, an increase in the proportion of carbon dioxide, methane, freons, nitrous oxide.

Let's not "pull" more sensational (to the detriment of correctness) assessments from Academician Golitsyn. The main sensation is not in the plane "for Illarionov or for Kyoto?". It turned out that in the work of the highly scientific world "Kyoto" meeting, dividing the emission quotas of billions of dollars, the old postulate of Iosif Vissarionovich is most relevant. With regard to the topic "It doesn't matter how much carbon dioxide is emitted, what matters is how they calculate it". And how do you think they count in Kyoto today? According to several measurements, a global figure of emissions is given, then countries that are technically equipped put in certificates about the measurements of their emissions. "And the rest is yours!" - "Accepted!" ... Everything, there is simply no other procedure. It may be difficult for an unprepared reader to believe in such a direct and simple algorithm, but it's true: "I couldn't measure, prove my outliers -

314

take the planetary level." [Kyoto's main requirement for Russia is not to exceed the 1990 emission level by 2012. Intuitively, everyone understands that our forests are the main world filter that cleans the atmosphere of the planet, and we should receive huge money for this. But the song "My country is wide ... there are many forests and fields in it ..." cannot be attached to the Kyoto Protocol. The "production" going on in RAO "Russian Forest" is extensive, in order to prove its parameters, it is necessary to cover the entire country with a network of observatories equipped with equipment recognized by all countries, including potential payers. The cost of one station that produces recognized data is about a million dollars, our areas require hundreds of them... The answer of the IAP RAS turned out to be "asymmetric", in the style of the arms race era, when billion-dollar threats were parried with penny countermeasures. A mobile laboratory that meets all the requirements for a global network of observatory stations, monitoring throughout Russia...

Academician Golitsyn continues:

— So, we named it: TROICA (Transportable observatory for the study and control of the atmosphere). Its instruments and international calibration tools provide high quality data, linking them to the world network of atmospheric monitoring. The idea was implemented jointly with the All-Russian Research Institute of Railway Transport and the Max Planck Institute of Chemistry (Germany). TROICA conducts regular measurements along the electrified railways of Russia on the routes Moscow - Vladivostok, Murmansk - Kislovodsk. The observatory was included in the international observing networks SloBa[A]-tozNens\Maev (CAM) and MefmoK south eecNop o! ZgafozVer-1s SPApee (MOZS). Our data are used to validate international scientific satellite atmospheric monitoring systems in the USA and Europe... The prevailing transfer of air masses from West to East, continuous measurements give a stunning picture of how the common wedge of pollution, stretching tongue from Europe, is gradually narrowing, thinning above

Siberia. The cleansing process is almost visible! Over Birobidzhan, a huge excess of concentration

315

ozone, further monitoring showed the trajectory - monsoon transport from Japan, the source - their car fleet.

— With ecology, as well as with democracy, not everything is simple. Our cars are guilty of elementary carbon monoxide, and high-tech Japanese, as it turned out, - volatile organic matter. Nearby, on the streets of the city, everything seems to be fine, but the consequences are in the upper layers of the atmosphere.

— The data set received by TROIKA made a great impression in the world community, and the Laboratory for Diagnostics and Monitoring of Climate (USA) joined our program. Such mobile observatories wanted to get countries, first of all, with a large territory: the USA, Australia, Canada. BUT... their railroads are not electrified.

- Yes. From science to politics... both great and ridiculous! The finest measurements of TRICs simply cannot be carried out in the case of diesel traction: the "exhaust" plume will block it. For 20 years we have become so accustomed to the teachings of the West, incl. on the "purity of technology", that we forget to look into the "specifics". So here's an "offhand example": the railways of the USA and Canada, in comparison with our electrified ones, are dirty and backward. (Another reason to think about the motives for years of reproaches against "dirty Russian technologies".)

Reference. The most important results of the work of TROIKA:

1. The most polluted regions of Russia were determined (the region of Lake Baikal, where, due to stable closed air circulation, pollution accumulates in the surface air).
2. The main anthropogenic and natural sources of ozone precursors, gaseous and aerosol impurities have been determined. Characteristics of plumes from cities are determined.
3. Found: in Russia, ozone concentrations under certain conditions can increase to dangerous values. This occurs under certain weather conditions and the presence of volatile organic compounds. Significant concentrations, up to 340 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, formed in the cities of Khabarovsk Krai and in Moscow in the summer of 2002 in smog situations.
4. It is shown that the high content of methane in summer over Western Siberia is almost entirely caused by its emissions from moist soil and swamps. That is, experts' assessments of significant leakages of natural gas during its production and transportation due to the use of obsolete technologies and equipment by Gazprom have been refuted.

316

5. Found: high-voltage power lines are a source of ozone and other radicals. But in polluted areas, power lines activate the oxidation of organic compounds emitted by industry and transport, i.e. play the role of a wastewater treatment facility. (That is, minus times minus plus.)
6. In the whole country, the level of toxic organochlorine compounds accumulated in plants is not high. But there are areas (Kalmykia, Baikal, Kola Peninsula), where their content is so high that the forests are in a depressed state.

For you to understand the meaning of point #4 of this report alone, I will tell the following story. In our dashing years, one group of our scientists was hired (given an EU grant) to evaluate the Russian West Siberian methane emission. And they counted 40 megatons per year ... in the places where our natural gas is extracted - from our "leaky" gas pipelines. Institute of IAP RAS

Georgy Sergeevich Golitsyn and the Planck Institute ([Germany]), headed by the Nobel laureate and friend of Golitsyn, and of Russia, Krutzen. Their calculation (not supported by an EU grant!) turned out to be 6 megatons per year. And now the TROIK measurements have proven them, Krutzen and Golitsyn, right. 6 megatons, and besides, not from "leaky Gazprom pipes", but from swamps! The last statement (sources of release) can be imagined by anyone who remembers the term "gradient": accurate measurements easily lead to the place of gas release by increasing concentration.

The magnanimous prince, academician [Olitsyn did not particularly "finish off" the refuted "experts", but we have something to think about here!

They made a mistake 6-7 times... These 40 megatons of pollution calculated for the EU grant are real "fuel", fuel for the work of both the anti-Gazprom and anti-Russian machines. Scientific support for another "expert assessment", for example Madeleine-Albright's, that ... "it is unfair that all the wealth of Siberia belongs to the Russians." It turns out that it is "unfair" also because they do not know how to organize the extraction and transportation of these riches there. Look, "scientists have calculated": 40 megatons of greenhouse gas methane poison the atmosphere ...

The experience of the last decades suggests in how many areas such "experts" evaluation "waited the same

317

of their time and got into "big politics". And in general, it's somehow alarming: scientists are often presented to us as "hope", the last resort, experts, "watchful eye", "conscience of the nation" ... What if some of them had only scientific equipment left. .. dollarometers and grantoscopes? ..

And Gazprom's image makers are broadcasting, poor fellows, on TV the same kitchen stove, burner, with the famous nasally cold: "Gazprom is a national treasure!" (it seems like everyone will be so cold without gas) and they don't even know who and when really defended the image of their "office" ...

Okay, Yuri Vdovin, "an expert on ecology and justice," seemed to be answered by academician Golitsyn and Nobel laureate Krutzen. Okay, Gazprom was charged with an extra 40 megatons/year of emissions, and we found out. But many of the secondary motifs of this "environmental suffering" plot are incomparably good. Think about it: in passing, it turns out that American railroads are still NOT electrified, that is, they are inferior to the technological and environmental level of the Soviet railways of the 1960s. That it is modern Japanese cars that produce the most dangerous exhaust...

But what problem remains? Proportionate coverage of these facts in the media. Tomorrow, another team of "granted" scientists will report emissions of mercury, arsenic from our gas pipelines... and further with all the stops according to the periodic table - according to the wishes of the "granting". And it will be spread out, voiced by hundreds of liberal media and will completely drown out what you just read about. Here you have another real "environmental pollutants" - the media. But this is already part of another direction, "the theater of operations of the COLD WAR".

So decide whether that rapprochement in the title is legitimate: eBenzgait and the Energy Charter? And the furious propagandists of the latter correspond to whom among the propagandists of the former?

But, I repeat, there will be a special chapter on the most famous Goebbels of the Cold War.

318

Chapter 6 CONSUMPTION RACE

In the introductory chapter "An Equation with an Unknown Number of Unknowns," it was stated that, in addition to the "arms race", the United States managed to impose on us another parallel "race", the significance of which for the outcome of the Cold War is greatly underestimated - the "consumption race".

Against what background did she unfold?

From the situation of the US nuclear monopoly in the 1940s, overwhelming superiority in delivery vehicles (aircraft, aircraft carriers, the expropriated Wernher von Braun, frantically building rockets), the USSR gradually moved first to parity, and then to superiority in many components of that competitions. Our secret geniuses perfectly mastered the tactics of the already famous "asymmetric responses" (when US \$50 billion threats were easily parried with e-million ruble responses). Our industry, chronically and significantly lagging behind in terms of labor productivity, nevertheless, despite all the most unfavorable "inputs" for us, gave out the result: in which case, our military industrial complex is guaranteed to destroy the United States. Or - in the terminology of the General Staff - will inflict "unacceptable losses" on them ...

That's it, with this "almost victory in my hands" (according to M. Khazin and many other experts), I'm done. All this is nothing more than an epigraph to the immediate topic of this chapter, namely our global loss. To the reasons and some non-trivial consequences of our loss at the end of that race and, in general, of the Cold War.

The explanation that the USSR lost ideologically, that the then version of communism-socialism was not competitive with capitalism, I do not really like. It turns out that the USSR lost the "championship in abstract terms", the championship in "...isms". What is the focus here? The very subdivision of history into "socio-economic formations" we received from the same hands, in the same book, where it was stated that, according to the same theory, such and such "formations" inevitably win and replace with themselves - such That. And table

319

ko have memorized it, that they even somehow forgot that behind the term "communism" there is no such objectivity as behind ... gravity, electromagnetic induction, radioactivity ... That the word itself came as part of a certain verbal combination (Sciences). What, in fact, they, "socialism", "communism", in the mouth of their creator meant: that which is inevitable, objectively wins, displaces, replaces itself.

It turns out that the very fact of non-victory cancels the very fact of their existence.

For example, they assembled a basketball team, hoping to win, but it didn't work out. But still, here they are, guys, sitting in front of us, worrying. They are.

But where can remain what was positioned as a synonym for an objectively inevitable triumph? Where can an invincible victory hide?

For some reason, we don't really think about this, rustling with these "...isms". It is all our natural pity that leads to a funny semantic shift. We stroke the erroneous book like a naughty cat... Absently forgetting that the guilty purr is there, but the guilty "...ism"... It simply doesn't exist.

Note. To the works of the great follower of Hegel, Karl Marx, the conversation will return several more times. His critique of the mode of production, which he calls capitalist, is indeed of great universal significance. And in general, Marx's criticism of the "alienation" of man is perhaps the highest rise of humanistic thought. Although, again, if we recall the dialectics of Marx's teacher, then the very existence of such a concept as "highest point", what does it mean? That's right: that further the trajectory will go down. Here is Karl Marx, having reached the remarkable, important for all time "criticism of the alienation of man", further

welcomed the executions of hostages by the Paris Communards (and this, in general, is also "from alienation" - life), etc.

But the most unpleasant thing is that about the collapse of his recipes for getting out of the circle of alienating production, we have a purely sadomasochistic conclusion ready: we did not follow the great book badly. Forgetting that Marx's foundation — the proposition about the relative and absolute impoverishment of the proletariat — collapsed back in the 20th century. And that already Engels, releasing the 4th volume of Capital, desperately redrawn and darned "Marxism", like a tailor after an unsuccessful fitting. "No, it's the client's fault!" — will be cut off by our social masochists dressed in black leather. But the "clients" were not only Russia. It is simply necessary to admit that the "prognostic beam" of "Capital" did not finish at a distance for more than 15 years...

320

It is much more productive to explore simpler, "textured" explanations for our defeat. Shortage, commodity hunger. The credibility of "our ... ism" was undermined by supply shortages. Such and such clothes were "thrown away" only at the end of the month, and such and such was only in the currency "Birches" and regional committee distributors, etc.

In the global competition with the USA and the West, we have lost the "consumption race". And it is this almost "kitchen" version that actually has almost boundless consequences, threads stretching through the entire history of mankind.

After all, the second fact, just as objective as the loss itself, is that the people of the USSR were by no means starving to death, they were not going naked.

From Germany in the first half of the 20th century, the famous slogan "Guns instead of butter" came as simple as "heil". And the obsessive prevalence, the divergence of this slogan provokes a very serious substitution, its erroneous application to the USSR of 1950-1980. |

Just the same, such a, practically the main, version of that Soviet-American collision was a global mistake: "The arms race exhausted the USSR." It was as if the USSR and the USA made a million "guns" aimed at each other, but the USA still had "oil", while the USSR did not.

In this verbal chain, the weak link is the word "exhausted". The images of the newsreels that rise behind him, the besieged Leningraders, the sufferers of Auschwitz, and so on. only obscure the following fact: losing the "consumption race" is not at all like dying of hunger or cold! Or even simply - "to be exhausted"...

Yes, in 1990 in the USSR one could already speak of the "outstretched bony hand of hunger", of real malnutrition. BUT... this moment was already preceded by several years of "merging" of both the life of our leading strata and strata according to our well-known principle "the worse, the better". (Several times in Russian history, this principle has taken possession of the relatively broad masses.) This is a topic for a completely different study, but now we are talking about the peak of our competition with the West, about the period (according to Khazin, for example) of refusing to win. Or "break", etc. Chro

321

Nologically, this is the 70s. Plus some "tops" in the 80s and "roots" in the 60s respectively.

We all remember the growing social irritation then, a kind of neurosis, looking for something to turn to. Through the "world of ideas" this irritation glided, practically not clinging to anything (these ideas given to us in various "...isms" were too smooth and streamlined). Yes, it is also noteworthy that few people doubted the model itself, the ultimate victory over capitalism. Even the most

An anti-Soviet anecdote played on this generally accepted reality: "We won't live to see communism, but feel sorry for the children!"

But on the other hand, in the surrounding material, commodity world, in the world of consumption, the reasons for dissatisfaction began to be found in geometric progression.

The nature of this discontent is the most interesting moment in the history of that consumption race. The moment is important to this day, and even very important for the future survival of mankind, no matter how loud it may sound. After all, the consumption race imposed on us by no means ended with the defeat and collapse of the USSR

This idea, in general, was formulated many times, something like: "Jeans defeated the USSR!" Sometimes some other, symbolically important goods, the so-called icons of consumption, were also named. What can you think about here? About the next important paradox. After all, the development model of the USSR did not at all imply a one-time sucking of blood from its subjects (I remind you, we are talking about the period of 1940-1980, the USSR-USA race) ... the sale of this blood for the sake of new weapons or, more generally speaking, "for the sake of developing production means of production", for the sake of that same "group A", for the sake of weapons... No, our modest "group of industries B" fed and clothed the Soviet people in accordance with historical, climatic conditions, etc.

It seems to turn out like this: there is a competition, a man in Chicago and a man in Leningrad are racing to make "guns" ("instead of butter" or there "together with butter" - it doesn't matter yet) ... A Leningrader who lagged behind after the Second World War gradually to at the beginning of the 1960s, catches up with the Chicagoan, starts to overtake, but suddenly ... he thinks deeply

322

and carefully examines his clothes, compares them with Chicago.

- Are you warm? - Yes. But it's not pretty.

- Why is it ugly? - Because it's not fashionable.

"What is fashion?" — the head of the Leningrader thinks. Pants are wide - pants are tight. The toes of the shoes are sharp - the toes are blunt. It looks like a cycle...

It's funny that the history of fashion has preserved all the textured details. In particular, that historical moment has been preserved when, for the first time in history, the leader of the USSR (at that time, N.S. Khrushchev) made a statement on the issue of fashion. Then, it turns out, there was a transition from wide trousers to narrow ones.

The historical text itself has also been preserved. This is the plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU, December 1956. Khrushchev: "Our men walk around like shaggy doves, their trousers hang down at the bottom. The whole West wears trousers narrower, shorter than ours."

Then, after the plenum of 1956, the Soviet light industry, "Group B", managed to react and launched the production of fashionable tight trousers. The conflict has been exhausted... for several years.

But this point itself deserves to be singled out in our history, in the history of the confrontation between the USSR and the USA, in the "consumption race". After all, it was not Nikita Sergeyevich's personal taste that prompted him to take up arms against wide trousers. Even pick up an image: like shaggy doves.

Recall the photographs of his meetings, conversations with John F. Kennedy: Khrushchev himself in a very baggy (and one might even say "loose") pair, and John in a "skinny" one... But, apparently, the very political instinct (let us return to our plenums) suggested to the leaders in 1956 that the "masses" were very serious about fashion and that they should "give the country" pipe trousers.

But excuse me for repeating the well-known: the very idea of "fashion", it does not mean the victory of some style, "silhouette". "Fashion" is a constant change, the ability to forever turn the roulette wheel of these "styles".

And by the way, remember, for example, the fashion of the 1980s! Mentally "photograph" and then combine with the footage of that meeting of our First Secretary with the President of the United States.

323

It turns out that it was Khrushchev dressed according to fashion, and Kennedy in his fitted jacket - "straggler", "came from a remote province" ... or what other synonyms did we have for "unfashionable"? True, this comparison effect will be somewhat mixed by Kennedy's superiority in objective, physical parameters: height, shoulder width, lack of a "belly". But nevertheless, a few photos of the 1980s that turned up - politicians, actors - remind us of this turn. And Phil Collins (his poster just turned up) from the most popular group of the 1980s, Genesis, is just in a 100% Khrushchev suit, just that "shaggy dove"!

And those trousers, awarded the "personal analysis" at the Plenum of the CPSU, by that time had already gone through a long series of metamorphoses. A schoolboy of the 1970s, for example, remembers what a nightmare it is, what a horror it is when you have only pipe trousers! But without "flares" it's simply impossible to come to the dance. How wretched and naive were all the half-measures sewn on the bottom of the legs "wedges"! (The fact that the inserted "wedges" were sometimes made of a different fabric only emphasized the desperation of that struggle.)

Yes, the fashion carousel was spinning almost always. It can be said that for many centuries there were continuous changes in human attire, but earlier changes had the main component - objective progress. That is, they were associated with the development of new materials: skin, wool, silk, cotton, synthetic fibers...

But in one wonderful era that has yet to be explored, such amazing forces joined this process, which we will also have to consider, that as a result, fashion has become both a battlefield, and a weapon, and a fundamentally new source of super profits, and much more than.

It is very remarkable that in the 1930s the USSR was still quite in step with the fashion trends (those "apaches", white shoes...). Although even then fashion mostly came "from there", it was, so to speak, quite "attainable". Technologically accessible as well, there was a quite fair feeling that — a little, just a little "push", throw a small fraction of a percent of the budget on that "group B", and talk about some difference in clothing in general

324

won't have to. Another interesting point. Fashion in the 1930s, while not yet a means of pressure from the wealthy world, was, in general, cheap fashion. And what is characteristic, the trendsetters of style ("trends") were the inhabitants of regions that were not at all rich: Spaniards, Basques, Latin Americans, "Mediterraneans", "southerners". The then millionaires did not reign in mass tastes, like the current one ... Donald Trump. And the main "cult" clothing of that time (similar to jeans of the second half of the century, but - a shirt) - "apache" (French araswe) - came to Europe, generally speaking, from the Apache Indians. And it is also important, besides, that the "Apache" came through the French poor, the street gang ... Caps, by the way, including our "Party" caps, they also came from the proletarian quarters of Paris.

But then, in those very 1950s (going from the 1930s, one must, of course, skip the period of "world subtraction", the struggle for survival, that is, the world war), Fashion became not only more rapidly changing, but everything more and more expensive. Fashion has become a real, effective press.

To think about it, it turns out that Stalin's campaign of "fighting servility to the West" (10-15 years before the inclusion of this press - "fashion") is simply an amazing example of foresight and an attempt to pre-empt.

So, the USSR, which in the 1930s kept up with the world, European fashion, in the 1950s-1970s became chronically lagging behind at every turn.

Two objective tendencies converged here. We can cite a few more facts proving the objective acceleration and rise in the cost of new rounds of fashion, but this does not mean that we can forget about another reason for the lag: the much greater inertia of the Soviet economic mechanism. Possessing significant mobilization advantages, the ability to concentrate resources and efforts on several important areas of development, the Soviet management model was just as significantly inferior in terms of maneuverability and, most importantly, in the ability to self-adjust.

Do you remember Prince Golitsyn's 1931 Prediction of the Fate of the USSR?

325

...his fall will be followed by the force of inertia, not under the blows of a thunderstorm or in the gusts of a storm, but somehow by itself, by its own weight, i.e. unsuitability for the real world around him, his atmosphere, his conditions.

The USSR, almost winning the arms race, managed to more or less feed, clothe and shoe its population. But to the fact that we must suddenly urgently replace 150 million pairs of "still almost untrodden shoes" with "the same, but with sharp toes"! Or then, on the contrary, - "with rounded ones". Here the balance did not converge.

Remember those heaps of clothes, shoes, all kinds of plastic "consumer goods" that really somehow oppressed or sometimes irritated the eye. It is interesting to think about the very nature of this oppression/irritation. Even those who absolutely believed the authorities sighed: "How much wool (cotton, leather) they ruined!"

I myself, as far as I remember, walked at an accelerated pace past the tapestries of these terrifying products, and now I remember, I think: "What is fashion?"

After all, just hint, 'that: "Comrades, but it's warm, it doesn't get wet!" - I will immediately hear: "Ah, you are one of those

that they wanted to dress us in quilted jackets, kirzachi - and to the machine! Whereas themselves ... "Yes, maybe that's the point: "Then how themselves ..." - and mono

cast system of compatriots, more or less resistant to the paroxysms of fashion, was broken somewhere at the top? Indeed, "whereas they themselves..." — I myself, working in the system of the Ministry of Foreign Trade of the USSR, I remember bringing suitcases from business trips abroad...

What I am sure of is that no secret meetings were held on the winning side with an agenda like:

"In the Soviets, industry is bad, it is slowly being reorganized. Coordination, inclusion in the "five-year plan". All these lasts, templates, approved sketches...etc. So let's now change the fashion for the shape of the lapels every six months, once a year for the width of the trousers. Let's knock out all the wool and cotton from them! .. So, who is responsible for these fagots couturier? Take action.

There were definitely no such meetings, neither Zion's nor Arizona's sages. But what exactly happened was a global, long

326

a temporary bet on the American way of life as a sure weapon. The Americans, boasting, competing in consumption with each other, will at the same time, even against their will, compete with the Soviets... If the USSR reaches parity at some "primitive" level, then this level will be raised. This is how to raise and constantly project your way of life onto that territory.

But the most important consequence of this race was mentioned in the chapter "An Equation with an Unknown Number of Unknowns": the race did not end with the collapse of the USSR. The generally recognized cause of the current world crisis is American overconsumption in debt. (Before, as we remember, there were "crises of overproduction", I would like to call the current global one "crisis of overconsumption"). And a significant part of this overconsumption is inspired, induced by advertising that grew up in the atmosphere of the race.

"EXPERTS AND MYSTERIES"

Now for this section, I want to propose, perhaps, the most unexpected person.

Once, having thought up for the magazine, where I was the head editor for some time, the heading "Spiritual Expertise" (the predecessor, as you might guess, of the special headings of this book), I had a chance to talk with Archbishop Alexy of Orekhovo-Zuevsky, vicar of the Moscow diocese.

My question was:

"Which of the theories, ideas of the last time seems to you the most dangerous?"

To be honest, I imagined that most likely the Lord would attack one of the most arrogant sects, pseudo-religions, so to speak, the closest, "current enemies". That is, he will not miss the opportunity to hit these, in general, well-deserving blows. Vladyka promised to think and answer in writing.

And now imagine how amazing his answer was:

"Such, in my opinion, is the theory of the "golden billion," i. model of life of the selected part
humanity from

327

how many highly developed countries, united, as an idea, by a high level of consumption. The entire modern civilization is built on the colossal successes of the natural sciences and technology as their continuation. But it is obvious that even just to maintain the current level of consumption of the "golden billion" in the near future there will not be enough resources, and an environmental catastrophe will become inevitable.

No government can offer the Americans, or the Europeans, or our new Russians, or the emerging "middle class" to tighten their belts and moderate their demands. Just imagine what will happen! Until recently, in an ecological sense, it seemed to a person that he is still in paradise. The forces of nature were used for production, and nothing was done for reproduction. But today it is given to us to evaluate all the consequences of our expulsion from paradise and understand the scale of the curse: "Cursed is the earth for you; in sorrow you shall eat of it all the days of your life" (Genesis 3:17). Today, all the falsity of daring to regain paradise on earth, contrary to Divine Providence, has been revealed.

And usually they offer a way out something like this: "Since science has led to all this, let it lead! We have no choice, we will have to act on the environment."

And when the deadline for paying all bills approached, it turned out that a modern civilized person is not capable of either the austerity of consumer self-restraint, or the austerity of genuine creativity.

While maintaining the ascetic religious component, one can hope for movement towards internal self-discipline. In this case, science can also develop in the right direction. If Christian asceticism dries up, then a type of personality will prevail that does not tolerate any restrictions in the desire to consume, does not want to answer to the future. Scientific research and experiments to save the existing type of consumer civilization, the "golden billion" can lead to the destruction of life on Earth. The only alternative to such a development can be an ascetic Christian civilization (...).

You will especially appreciate this answer of Archbishop Alexy if you compare what the idol of Intel writes on the same occasion.

328

lectuals of the last two decades. Jean Baudriard: "A consumer society is one where not only there are objects and goods that can be bought, where consumption itself is consumed in the form of a myth."

Where the famous philosopher, bewildered or perhaps fascinated, states the onset of the era of consumption, our theologian both points out the way out and finds a possible source of strength to follow this path.

The moment that logically connects both parts of this book is the heavy burden of responsibility of the Conqueror. In chapter 19, "So what do we do with this Victory?!" they talked about the problems of the USSR after 1945, but here it is necessary to mention the responsibility of the winner in the cold war. The Consumption Race, it turns out, has no less serious consequences than the [Arms race. I remember in the days of "perestroika" and the fight against the Soviet VIK - shots: training grounds somewhere between Kurgan and Omsk - endless rows of tanks, hundreds of hectares of unnecessary armored vehicles. But here is the other side, another race: the last resources of the planet are thrown into the production of practically unnecessary things. Former "Consumer [Icons]," iconic, trendy products, "Style Icons" dropped from the Fashion Carousel (becoming more of a Fashion Centrifuge). The war for the last deposits and nearby - for landfill sites and the construction of new waste incineration plants.

Chapter 7

PROBLEMS OF THE RK DEPARTMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION CORPORATION

No, of course, the author does not pretend to be a general analysis - from the sea of our current propaganda problems, we will draw out only those related to the Second World War and its geopolitical consequences. However, we will immediately see how many more acutely modern political issues will follow.

As an example of the need to work with the PB factor, in Chapter 9 I cite the following paradox.

329

Countless times it has been described how, after the defeat of Poland by Germany on September 17, "Soviet troops crossed the undefended eastern (Polish) border." Do you notice how touching it sounds "unprotected" on a romantic or everyday level?! As if an additional condemnation of the one who crossed the unprotected border. Demagogues and historians of hysteria have repeated this a thousand times in their "historical critical" studies. "Fixed" - here we found another point of accusation: "... unprotected!" In the world of real politics, exactly the opposite! Unprotected means that no Polish troops were drawn to it. This means that the USSR did not actually influence the course (and outcome) of the two-week Polish-German war!

This means that this is the job for the "RT Department of the Russian Federation Corporation": to ensure the widest possible dissemination of the corresponding "Gress release regarding the pact

Molotov - Ribbentrop. Where to explain the then harsh realities, and where to indicate the place: those who left the war cannot dictate the rules of war.

Another example of the absolutely necessary RK-maneuverability. If during the war our newspapers even mentioned the fact of "the heroic French resistance movement — the strike of French miners", then today it is time to say that a strike is an effective means only against the backdrop of productive work. Even young people, immigrants and citizens of France, burning cars, simply could not threaten to strike, because they were much less integrated into the economic mechanism than the Europeans of the 1940s were under Hitler.

We must remind you that on the "resistance scale" car fires and street riots are much, much higher than a strike...

Accompany our arguments with good shots. Illustration: some trade union bosses in a meeting room, at the same table with the owners (without a signature and you won't understand who is who), cups of coffee, spread out papers, polite smiles...

This is an exemplary answer to European parliamentarians who cover the SS parades in Riga and demand gay parades in Moscow, and in the absence of them, that is, "in the absence of democracy in Moscow", challenging Russia's right even to its energy resources.

330

And today, for example, such a logical chain is being successfully introduced by them into the "cleansed" public consciousness.

- Is a gay parade banned in Moscow?

"So there is no democracy in Russia!"

- So, Russia has no right to sell its resources at world prices! (Attempts to approach which are "energy blackmail"!)

Therefore, all, all the slightest facts of similarity, continuity of Europe-194 [and Europe-2007 (8,9...)] should be constantly highlighted by this "RK department", become the same subject of discussions, books, articles, films, like "human rights", "minority rights", "democratic values" and other similar topics where we are played traditionally and masterfully. A recent example: Russia tried to raise the price of gas to Ukraine (from a quarter of the world market price to a half) and became an "energy blackmailer", a strangler of the orange democratic revolution."

Arrangement of some final touches of the book "Second World War. Reboot" took place in August 2006, which made it possible to attach the following speech by President Bush on Thursday, September 7, 2006, according to the text of the Reuters report.

A few months after the publication of the book, in the summer of 2007, the aggravation (already "off-season") of anti-Russian attacks prompted me to publish this fragment of the book as a separate article in Literaturnaya Gazeta. Having come up with one neologism for the title. I am citing the article along with one very characteristic response letter (electronic) that arrived at the newspaper's website and "hanging" there, in my opinion, to this day. So: Literaturnaya Gazeta, July 2007.

ALL THIS BUSH ("The End of History" in one single (White) house)

Address by President Bush to members of the American Military Officers Association Thursday, September 7, 2006 (Reuters feed):

331

"The world paid a "terrible price" by not paying attention to the words of Lenin in its time. The Soviet empire that he (Lenin) founded destroyed tens of millions and brought the world to the brink of thermonuclear war. ... What al-Qaeda and other Islamic terrorist organizations proclaim as their target must be taken seriously. Bin Laden and his terrorist allies state their intentions as clearly as Lenin did before them. In our fight against terrorism, we will not stop until Hitler is eliminated. ... a threat to civilization (...)".

Now I explain to my compatriots, who happily avoided the intrusion into their everyday lexicon of "PR" and advertising terminology. A Bush performance is "positioning" in the classic advertising and PR sense. That is, the object is NOT characterized, but "positioned", that is, it is placed on a par with others, to which the relation has ALREADY been formed. And Lenin is put on a par with Bin Laden and Hitler. He "also threatened, also did not listen, also exterminated millions. His empire brought the world to the brink of thermonuclear war."

It seems ridiculous for me to justify Lenin here, but Bush has a sense: quickly move on to the "state of Lenin." Yes, there were many revolutions after the First World War, everyone threatened them, but it was Lenin's "threats against the United States" that were the most unsupported. The United States was attacked by those who did not threaten. And today, Bush "to file to the point" the lyrics of the song "We will destroy the whole world of violence" - this is ... judge for yourself - what.

Further: "His (Lenin's) power brought the world to the brink of nuclear war" - this is Bush about the very time when the USSR, being surrounded by dozens of US bases (American bases in Turkey were generally near the Soviet border), tried the only time to establish its own, similar, in Cuba. The "Caribbean Crisis" is the only Soviet attempt, a step towards parity with the United States in terms of military bases: mutual military, diplomatic maneuvers, mutual threats, and now it turns out ... that it was the USSR that brought the world to the brink of nuclear war. Here the shameless politician is silent that only the United States has so far waged a nuclear war. Bush is sure that with such a skillful

332

"positioning" of Lenin with Hitler and Bin Laden the whole world will forget Hiroshima. "And who put the world on the brink of a nuclear war, and who put the world on the brink of a nuclear war..." — he is the master of the world, which means he is the master of the history of the world, he will point his finger — everyone will be afraid to even remember.

That is, like the withdrawal from the ABM treaty, the States have left the system of any moral framework. Their kind, eternal international mediator, Nobel Peace Prize winner, ex-President Jimmy Carter has long assumed the function of a "good investigator". And the other "investigator" is Bush today. And he knows perfectly well that Al-Qaeda was created by the United States (but failed to manage it), but he sticks it, Al-Qaeda, to Lenin and, as can be seen from the RK context, to Russia.

But the purely technological method of "positioning" can also be applied to the "Glavexpert on Peace and Democracy" itself... Recall when Bush trained the American Association of Military Officers against Russia?

September 7, 2006, the 5th anniversary of the New York bombings. That is, Bush decided: "Why should 3,000 victims go to waste! Let's use their memory for current political purposes!"

With whom/what can this utilitarian logic be compared?. The hunter beats the fox terrier with a fox skin, baits it ... [the immler also disposed of the bones of his victims: bone meal. And he didn't let his hair go to waste, not to mention gold teeth.

Such is this ... bush. And our citizens simply must be aware: for what? on whom? by whom? - Trained, RYu - baited ... American Association of Military Officers.

That is the meaning of the subtitle, "the end of history" - the point after which the historian has nothing to do. Naked PR, advertising, propaganda and counter-propaganda, which then someday, someone, perhaps, will include in the Annals. Other Tacitus...

And now remember who Bush STILL positioned "as a source of nuclear threat"? Four years ago? That's right, Saddam Hussein! Here Bush, in addition to the utilitarian Himmler, can be compared ("positioned") with the inspired Goebbels...

2003, White House Press Secretary Ari Fleischer admits: "U.S. President George W. Bush, speaking before Congress in January 2002, made a false statement

333

about the fact that Niger supplied uranium to Iraq, which allegedly testified to the nuclear program of the Hussein regime".

BBC journalist Andrew Gilligan exposed this Anglo-American lie. British Prime Minister Blair: "History will forgive us even if the evidence that Baghdad had weapons of mass destruction was exaggerated." It turns out that the Americans can somehow magically transfer the gift of a special, criminal relationship with History to their closest satellites. It's only a pity that Bush and Blair were able to convince their own subordinate of these magical qualities: 59-year-old expert David Kelly, whose reports they completely misrepresented to the whole world in a Goebbels way, committed suicide...

Then I had to turn on... Lie No. 2: Saddam's connection with... yes, yes... the same trouble-free, all-weather all-weather American PR al-Qaeda... The results are ambiguous: presidential experts on Al-Qaeda Caide "until they seemed to be thrown out of the windows of Langley, they didn't open their own veins, like David Kelly. But on the other hand, not a single fact confirming the connection between Saddam and Al-Qaeda has been found. So a third motive for the invasion was also required: "brutality", the multiplicity of victims of the Saddam regime. It remains only to sum up the reports of today's victims in Iraq and wait... Wait what else the authors of this unique Iraqi project will come up with. The project, which can be called, stylized as the old UN: "Oil in exchange for humiliation."

Wait and, of course, remember... all this "bush" addressed to the American Association of Military Officers: "His (Lenin's) power brought the world to the brink of nuclear war." And the result in the sense of the genre, in my opinion, is such that only the simplest popular print, leaflet logic remains: "Read it and pass it on to someone else!" You can only answer this ... bush in the form of ... well, let's say, like this:

Little Bush came to his father, And the baby asked:

Is it good to grab oil? - Yes, son, not bad ... Announce: Saddam is a vampire, Atomic bombs are the master,

But American GIs will save the free world.

334

The answer to my "litgazetovskaya" article was signed: "Ryu Migoap [2gaemsN], but this is quite a common thing for Internet polemics. Everyone chooses nicknames. But the answer itself once again confirmed the importance of the whole direction of History-Counter-propaganda. I quote:

"It is not clear what made the author almost a year later, since September 2006, suddenly break out with such an "article". Offended by Lenin? Every suggestion can be refuted. It is either a mistake, or a distortion, or a lie. I will focus only on the key points.

]. Al-Qaeda was not created by any America. Back in Afghanistan, the so-called Arab Afghans, the backbone of the future Al-Qaeda, including Bin Laden, belonged to the West, and in

especially to the Americans, nasty. Up to "kill the kafir."

2. No one needs to forget about the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and no one is pursuing such a goal. These bombings saved the lives of MILLIONS of lives - both American soldiers and Japanese soldiers and civilians - who would have been inevitably lost in the event of a US invasion of the Japanese islands.

3. The history of Saddam and WMD is fairly well documented by the UN, including in Blix's reports. As recently as January 2003, Blix was listing which elements of Saddam's WMD program were still hidden by Iraq. The intelligence that Bush and Blair operated on was, of course, not 100% guaranteed. And what intelligence is guaranteed? We have to act in conditions of lack of information. But it was not Bush's duty to prove that Saddam had WMD. According to Resolution 1441, it was Saddam's duty to prove that he had canceled all programs. What he didn't do. Regarding Saddam's connection with terrorists, including AK... President Putin said that Saddam was preparing terrorist attacks in the USA. Lied, or what, Guarantor? I will stop there. Enough. It is regrettable that the country, which itself has experienced what the global jihad is, in the Caucasus, puts spokes in the wheels of the ONLY COUNTRY that is still able to resist this jihad globally. Do you think to agree with them sooner or later? (...)"

335

My answer, of course, is not only to the author of the above-quoted "strategem", but also to many others. thinking alike.

(1)

It seems to be a simple matter - once again to confirm that the United States did create Al-Qaeda. This is proved by a whole book by the well-known European parliamentarian Giulietto Chiesa - "Endless War" (M., 2003. Foreword by Gino Strada). This confirms, more precisely, the creation of "al-Qaeda" even boasts! Zbigniew Brzezinski. Yes, President Carter's national security adviser is proud that he "led the USSR into the Afghan trap."

As you know, on December 24, 1979, Soviet troops entered Afghanistan.

But as early as July 3, 1979, Brzezinski says, he sent a memorandum to the president in which he expressed the opinion that "assistance to the opponents of the Afghan regime (Karmal-Amin) would encourage the Soviet Union to intervene militarily." And President Carter signed the first directive to provide clandestine assistance to opponents of the regime in Kabul.

This is confirmed by the then director of the CIA, Robert Gates.

Interview with the French newspaper M#otsue | OBzeguzheig 18-25 January 1998 (and a little earlier in an interview with the SMM network, 13 June 1997)

Question "Nouvel Observateur": Do you regret that you promoted Islamic fundamentalism, that you supplied weapons and advised future terrorists?

3. Brzezinski (as the French interviewers note, he is surprised):

This covert operation was a great idea. Its purpose was to lure the Russians into an Afghan trap, and you want me to regret it?

What is more important in terms of the history of the world? Taliban or the fall of the Soviet empire? (...)

The United States developed a list of sanctions and other measures in order to force the USSR to pay a "big price" for the adventure they inspired. Brzezinski personally visited Pa-

336

Kistan, in order to coordinate joint efforts with this Muslim country and draw the Saudis, Egyptians, Chinese into the anti-Soviet axis...

In general - all the old facts. The following argument was new in a remark to my article: "Even in Afghanistan, the so-called Arab Afghans are the backbone of the future Al

Qaeda, including Bin Laden, treated the West and especially the Americans badly. Up to "kill the kafir>".

That is, they make excuses that their clients hated them just the same!

That is, Someone, the Customer, hired the Killer, handed him a gun (more precisely, a whole arsenal, including the Stinger missiles that shot down Soviet aircraft) and now makes excuses: yes, that Killer was such a beast, he and me ready to kill! And me, and another hundred infidels can soak!

For normal (so far) human logic, is the supply of weapons to SUCH a killer an aggravating circumstance?

And if Russia began to supply its MANPADS to the Iraqi Mujahideen, the flow of coffins to the United States would definitely increase tenfold, and in justification we would say: is Russia also a hated infidel country for the Mujahideen?

(2)

You may be right in your calculations: the bombing of Hiroshima-Nagasaki saved perhaps more by averting the invasion of Japan.

I was talking about cynicism, about that bush ... that reproaches: the USSR brought the world to the brink of nuclear war. This bush is about the Caribbean Crisis, when in response to dozens of US bases around the USSR from Turkey to Korea and Japan, we dared to put one in Cuba. And, by the way, for the departure of missiles from Cuba, the USSR then demanded the liquidation of the American base

in Turkey. It seems to be a normal military-diplomatic process, but all the crisis, the world "on-the-border-military" is

from too angry perception of the USA even the most remote attempts of someone to be equal to them (on bases).

337

And with all this, reproach the USSR: "put them on the brink of a nuclear war," when they themselves were already putting peace and BEYOND! (Hiroshima...)

(3)

Your arguments about Iraqi WMD, Blix's report. But here the author of Bushy himself let you down, in his farewell, concluding speech at the White House, saying: "The big disappointment was that no WMD was found in Iraq." Quite a characteristic, "farewell bush": it's a pity not that they bombed, it's a pity that, having bombed, they did not find any reasons for the bombing!

(4)

It is regrettable that the country, which itself has experienced what the global jihad is, in the Caucasus, puts spokes in the wheels of the ONLY COUNTRY that is still able to resist this jihad globally.

ONLY ... What are you talking about? About the status, about the opportunity? Let's say you even accurately weighed, evaluated: ONLY the USA is still able to. And let's say, as you think, everyone should pay the Americans for "anti-jihadism". But, even purely logically... to be able does not mean to fight, does not mean to risk this state! Do you know exactly the intentions of this superfighter?

Is the attack on the Taliban in Afghanistan a necessary action after the skyscrapers? Let's not even be distracted by all these "white threads" stuck in the Pentagon and the missing airliners... But if Bush didn't organize something, somewhere, that would be a blow to internal stability in the United States.

Iraq. Saddam's permanent conflict with al-Qaeda is a well-known, "physical" fact. However, as well as the fact that Saddam has oil ...

So these two wars do not mean that the United States has thrown itself into jihad. Perhaps Bush, Cheney, Wolfowitz sincerely put on the armor of the crusaders, thinking that here they are ...

But even if this is true, if they take at least a step away from oil, towards some ideal campaign in which

338

you have already mentally sent them, your only ones, they will immediately be corrected: "US national interests" ...

Clinton, preparing to violate the sovereignty of Serbia, told the Europeans that now the concept of sovereignty (the Westphalian system) is no longer the main thing, in the name of universal values, sovereignty can be limited. And, proving this, he promised to sign the most important Kyoto Protocol for Europe! "Good" to Serbia received. And less than six months later, this aunt NUSA (US national interests) and the new President Bush said: The Kyoto Protocol will limit American industry, and we changed our minds about signing it ... And the Kyoto Protocol was originally restricting industry!

And the fight against Iran by encircling Russia with a missile defense ring is also not yet proof that the country you declared is the only one capable of anti-jihad has realized these abilities.

I don't want to incite this realization at all, I'm just pointing out that this guy running in front with an outstretched baseball cap: "Give it to the ONLY wrestler"! (you can also submit it in the form of forgetting your own state interests), to put it mildly, distorts the facts. Like all barkers... The very fabric of the world, the logic of the life of the human race is torn, cut by the blades of double standards.

OTHER EXAMPLES. EUROPEAN RW IS ALSO UNDERESTATED

July 2006, war in Lebanon. Euronews, a quiet, politically correct channel, obsessively repeated in each of its reports, 6 or 7 times: "Hizbollah fires from its Katyushas in response to Hezbollah's Katyushas ... near Hezbollah remain "Katyusha". Israeli cities...

That is, they used to complain about "jammers", now in the "open society" on the territory of Russia, at a frequency ceded to them every day until 10 am by our channel "Culture", quiet Europeans carefully, gradually, but also stubbornly "positioning". After all, absolutely any installations, of any production, launching jet-powered projectiles - all

339

they can be compared with each other, but here it is ... They used our "brand", "Katyusha" - the installation that worked for them, the Europeans, liberation in 1941-1945.

As far as our compatriots still do not understand the laws of this merciless RK war, I was reminded by an example that seems to be very far from us. Almost immediately after the collapsed towers, a bacteriological attack began on the United States, do you remember the envelopes with white powder? And all our media then repeated: "Anthrax, anthrax!" This, the final example of the chapter, is no longer about "their" cunning, but about our own ignorance. After all, the very disease that we so willingly married with the name of our main pantry, the region of "growing power of Russia", is called Anthrax in the West. The author of this book followed the then wave of idiocy and self-substitution, one might say, with "peripheral vision" ...

It is in this "RKV-chapter" that I will introduce myself to the reader as:

..Igor Shumeiko, journalist, "PR man", took part in the struggle for the return to Russia of our famous vodka brands ("Stolichnaya", "Moskovskaya", etc. from the well-known "Soyuzplodovy" list, 43 brands in total), my The article by RiLor and Smirnov was the first speech on the vodka superbrand stolen from Russia, which at that time brought in \$360 million a year to the Grand Metropolitan Concern's Hubline.

And when our TV commentators scattered around the world in their parrot robes frequented the cameras: "Anthrax, anthrax!" - my first thought, which flashed almost instantly, was: "But how can it be?! After all, we sell Sibirskaya vodka all over the world! Not Stolichka, of course, but also quite a working brand!"

Then I remembered Siberian Airlines, Siberian Aluminum, Sibneft... and so on. And then (I remembered) the words of dear old lady Madeleine Albright, Secretary of State under Clinton, and today the head of the National Democratic Institute: "It is unfair that all the wealth of Siberia belongs only to Russians!"

340

And most importantly! Back then (autumn 2001), Bush, who was rushing about with a scorched tail, had not yet got around to using this "Siberian self-set-up" in the way he positions today "Lenin's power that brought the world to the brink of nuclear war"!

The Western media then more often used (I specifically looked through English-language articles about the threat of poison in envelopes) their own name for the new world threat: Anthrax. And only our teleparrots, whose travel dollars, if we follow through, will eventually be paid for by Siberian oil and gas, then thoughtlessly repeated: "... an ulcer! ... an ulcer!"

AND ABOUT OTHER PERIODICALLY OPENING "REV-ULCERS"

At the 18th session (July 2009), the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, despite the protests of the Russian delegation, adopted a resolution on the initiative of Lithuania and Slovenia, stating that "in the 20th century, the countries of Europe experienced two most powerful totalitarian regimes — Nazi and Stalinist ". It also expresses deep concern over the glorification of totalitarian regimes and warns of the possible rise of extremist regimes. In addition, the OSCE proposes to declare August 23 the Day of Remembrance for the Victims of National

socialism and stalinism.

Chairman of the Memorial Society Arseniy Roginsky:

"The painful reaction of a number of Russian political and state figures is connected with two problems. First, by declaring itself the legal successor of the USSR, Russia was unable to truly rethink the entire Soviet legacy..."

Let me explain: August 23, proposed by the Lithuanians and the OSCE PA as the "Day of Remembrance for the Victims of National Socialism and Stalinism," is the day the Soviet-German pact was signed.

The logic and content of my entire book reveals the true meaning of this Lithuanian-COEC "RK-Resolution" and the like.

341

This is an attempt to obscure, obscure other dates, for example, March 21, 1939, six months before the pact, when Lithuania, which received international guarantees at Versailles (stronger than Poland had, since, in addition to England, France, in Lithuanian guarantors were also Italy, Japan...) the strategically important Memel district... and at the very first cry [it] gave it away without even protesting, not allowing the system of Versailles guarantees to be launched. "It was stupid to turn heads..." — as today's Lithuanian historians explain.

And about the additional obscuration of "Munich" by such resolutions, to be repeated. More importantly - logic! Chain of Consequences! For example, "Stalin's detachments", "Enkavedesheviki shooting at the retreating Red Army", "penal battalions" ... - is that cruel? Can you (a typical trick would be) deduce this from "personal sadism, childhood problems of Stalin and Beria"? Or did they, penal battalions, detachments, appear as the full force of the Nazi invasion manifested itself? Then who made Hitler so strong? Saved him in Munich from the already ready overthrow in Berlin?

Here, of course, sovereign Lithuania, peeling into the hands of Hitler, may not have betrayed as much as Czechoslovakia, France, Benelux, Sweden ... but, as they say, "the rich ...".

I hope that the above examples will show our compatriots What and Who surrounds us, the laws that operate in this environment. And it will somehow partially illustrate that complex multidimensional process, which is hinted at by the title of the first part of the book: "Second World War. Reboot".

Chapter 8 GENERALS OF RUSSIAN GLOSS

To be honest, the previous chapter makes me, as a journalist, wince a lot. It seems that the relevance, the "problem" (even in the title) is declared, the "RK department" is mentioned, albeit an imaginary one, but there is nothing that is called "direct action" in journalism. Presidents, prime ministers, secretaries of state and other globalism ... But the real pros

342

The problems of our ideological confrontation are by no means limited to the fencing of two presidents, two Foreign Ministries - some kind of global lines. Here I pulled out a really nightmarish speech by Bush, worthy of two dozen shoes, commented. And there, for example, someone catches the speeches of our president. And from the comparison of these speeches, ideological lines are drawn, which supposedly will determine the final influence on the population...

But to a large extent, this "population" will be influenced not by a comparison, but by a comparison of the content of two (four, six ...) speeches. The influence will be exerted by the entire mass of media, creating images, contexts, fashions, trends...

Keeping the vocabulary of the Cold War, speeches, programs of leaders can be likened to warheads, and the media to delivery vehicles. And then this chapter will be an attempt already "direct action", an attempt to deal with the real actors in this area of confrontation.

1. COMPETITIVE PRELUDE

Why is Microsoft's case good? He is "on the ear". The example of the firm of the world's top rich man illustrates the constant monopolistic pull of the "invisible hands of the market" and how these hands are mercilessly beaten in the OBZA themselves. In 1990, the Federal Trade Commission launched an investigation into Microsoft's suspicion of "load" trading: its operating systems were only sold with applications.

In 1996, the Me5sare company, in a letter to the US Department of Justice, accused Microsoft and, most importantly, highlighted the mechanism of "unfair competition". The fight against Microgiant was led by Jules Klein, head of the Justice Department's antitrust division, and Orrin Hatch, a Republican senator from Utah who chairs the House Judiciary Committee. In addition to the federal Department of Justice, the authorities of another 6 states are conducting their own investigations into the illegal activities of Microsoft ...

It is a recognized fact that Russian antimonopoly legislation is no worse than that of the United States, and the Americans in our Federal Antimonopoly Service are doing something like

343

Russian-American staff exercises on its, legislation, application. They share their rich experience of "antitrust struggle" (remember from our history books?). Lectures and "business games" show how to calculate, catch and legally defeat the emerging monopoly...

Summary of the above:

1) The "free world" recognizes that not all competition is "free", fair. It cannot be "left to its own devices", due to the constant tendency to overlap this "free flow";

2) in Russia, as well as in the world, there are laws and government agencies to eliminate unfair competition.

2. THE SAME "HAND" - BUT IN DIFFERENT POCKETS

The author's task is to draw attention, to take a fresh look at the "market segments" where this "unfair competition" removes superprofits and quietly, quietly, to himself, in a whisper thanks fate and our "blindness" with you...

Abundant, colorful magazine and newspaper showcases and stands, past which you, as if through theatrical scenery and curtains, pass every day. It is believed that the "invisible hand of the market" has been invisibly placing everything here in fair, competitively won places for twenty years now. Circulation = demand = "voice of the people", etc.

It cannot be said that the Commission of the FAS Russia completely ignores the "printing market". On July 17, 2006, in particular, she convict CJSC Burda Publishing House of violating Clause | Article 8 of the Federal Law "On Advertising".

..on page 33 of the magazine "Liza. Crosswords" CJSC "Burda Publishing House" No. 7 dated March 22, 2006

using...

Guided by... The Commission... DECIDED:

1. Recognize as inappropriate advertising of services of mobile communication companies for the sale of mobile content using images of people in obscene poses... by offering an audio recording of obscene language or intimate sounds...

344

2. Issue an order to CJSC Burda Publishing House to stop violating the laws of the Russian Federation.

What did I personally worry about in the comments about that Case? |

— "The anti-monopoly service was charged with the fight against pornography. It's none of her business, a separate service is needed here. "

"No, it's good that the FAS also catches pornography!"

And if, fellow citizens, you think about it, follow the following chain:

- 1) Was pornography an end or a means for Burda? Means;
- 2) means of competition - with the pornographers of magazines of the XXX series? - NO, a means of competition with "other cellular advertisers" pushing the same product, but without porno-doping!

In truth, this case started after the appeal of the deputies of the Moscow City Duma, who were outraged precisely by the obscenity of Burda. But for me, it would be better (in the interests of the state) if the goal of the FAS here was not to play the facets of "erotica/pornography", but strictly the presence / absence of doping, a head start in the competition. There would be more consistency and invariance.

Now about a fact well known to all editors and publishers. In order to be sold in kiosks, on stalls near the metro, you need not only to give copies for full sale with the calculation for what was sold after a significant period - these are just mere pennies in comparison with what you have to pay extra to a company holding kiosks (according to Moscow) 30-50 thousand USD per month. Do you think this is an accusation of a certain publishing agency that monopolized the newsstands near the subway?

Yes, it would be worth building a garden around these $2 \times 2 = 4$, around such banal facts!

No, my postulate is much more "heretical". Just in the newspaper and stall trade, monopolization is not one hundred percent. Close to "market division", but still not "totally

345

cent-grabbed": there are 2-4 firms struggling in this market. The point (here is the main "heresy"!) is not in them. Whoever owns the stalls (can you imagine their size?) - how many magazine covers, stacks of newspapers will be placed there?! ... so-and-so. And there were 41,080 newspapers in Russia in 2003 (an increase of 1.5 times compared to 2002). And the figures of 2008 are boring to get into.

Here are the newspaper distributors and they carry out a selection accessible to their understanding: according to the entrance fee. But even then they retain some semblance of social structuring. There is a sports shelf, fishing, automobile, women's, girls', men's ... That is, if a certain concern wishes to establish another 100 girls' magazines for all the remaining free women's names, and if it prepares all the necessary amounts, there will be no displacement.

So the whole thing (and all possible changes) is inside those shelves, "segments". It is here that a thinking person should be alerted ... XXE, EHM, O©®, Makhit, R1auBow, Rep {Voi\$e - what would it be for?

Remember, a few years ago there was a dispute with some Tatar figures who wished to switch to the Latin alphabet? The argument of a single, without quotes, Russia: the Cyrillic alphabet is needed as a state bond. Here it is, the enemy's hypothetical answer: the Latin alphabet is needed in order to understand your Moscow magazines.

But this pamphlet is not directed against foreign-letter names either. To the above list, you can add a Russian-speaking set with a funny zoological bias: "Bear", "Penguin", "Swallowtail".

Look through, make sure, the essence of this "segment": magazine = an appendix to a set of men's goods. Cars, watches, alcohol (despite everything, no FAS — "there can be no compromises here"), clothes, shaving accessories + "stars", "parties", "star parties", girlish breasts/buttocks, "star tastes", travelling, "more about the stars", politics... + magazines like Ezaité — a slightly different "format", the content is the same.

Denis Chuiko, CEO of the Logos-M media group (distribution, those same kiosks): "One way or another, all publishers declare that their magazine is

346

creates its own "lifestyle". But now we already understand that this is just a trick."

According to Denis Chuiko's forecasts, the number of men's magazines may increase one and a half times.

Let's take from this heap - perhaps even the best magazine, half a step away from the rave life story - Medved (No. 72, October 2003). There is even a text here: such as "ironic comprehension" - buffet-club-defile weekdays.

Heroine: "Who would you like to get laid with in a hurry? Over there with the one in the watch (Luzze Math? Or over there with the one in the style of Marlon Brando? .. .

Satire? But what if? Well, suppose the author was familiar with "Mr. Griboedov's text", and the slogan from there: "Happy hours do not watch", and then we have before us - damn it! - hidden parody! Roll call! Reminiscence, finally...

The only alarming thing is that the name of the watch (unlike, for example, the full name of another foreign-speaking actor) is given in Latin, that is, almost the company logo is interspersed in the "artistic" text.

The answer, as it should be, comes on the very last page of the magazine: on the "back cover" - the most expensive (after the title) platform for advertising. On the cover of that issue of the magazine is ... an advertising module ... Whose? Everything is correct. Only there is already real advertising: and a list of stores where you can buy a watch, for which, according to the text on page 34, you will get laid. And even the factory characteristics of that model: "water-resistant to a depth of 50 meters" and "the absence of the problem of 2100 in the calendar"! That is, a real playboy, like a certain substance, will emerge from any depth and live until ...

Here, by the way, the general (not only playboy) prospects of the market and its Invisible Hands are ajar. Remember how much computer scientists earned on the Y2K problem? And here are the new frontiers: the year 2100...

But if we return from the "beautiful" for watchmakers and billgates "far away" to the everyday life of today's "men's glossy magazines"? Think about it. What if the "back cover" of that issue was bought out by, say, MazeG Saga?!

347

"Who would you like to get laid with in a hurry? Out with the one in the style of Marlon Brando? Or the one with the credit card sticking out of his pants... god! "It's MazeG Sash!"

But isn't a credit card advertised as a convenient, discreet tool, as opposed to a thick wallet with cash?! Wouldn't such an advertising service turn out to be "bearish" - already in every sense, inadvertently for the "creative team of the magazine" by looping its name as well?!

And in no case do not consider this pamphlet a campaign for "decency", "high morality". As in the case of the Burda-FAS case, it is more important to highlight the internal mechanics, to find, as in the case of Mstozoyd-I\$A, covert trade in load, abuse of a dominant position in the market.

So the analytical work is just beginning here... [Let's try, however.

1. Where did 99% of the "men's list" products come from? Western Europe, USA.
2. Where did the magazines HHG, EHM, RowBow, Rep{rose, OO come from?

Individually, there can be no claims to any case: freedom of foreign trade.

But everyone knows about the synergy effect, when the factors mutually multiply their action... For decades, an alliance has been formed there: an advertiser (men's goods) - a men's magazine. And when these vests, Rolexes stepped towards us, founded factories on a new continent – the Russian versions of these HHG, EHM, Rlaubow, RetPotse, SO, Makhit can be considered as a shipping operation.

And when we see urban outdoor advertising, TV announcements of the next new magazine that has landed on us - things are simply unthinkable for a Russian publication, especially a newcomer, is this fair competition?

After all, it's not even the power of the publishing monsters Burda (Playboy) and Conde Nast (Esquire), sh4erepet{ Me4a (ENM magazine). It's also Mercedes cars, Michelin tires, vests...

348

Oksana Burluka, publisher of Men's Look: "Advertising in men's publications, like in all expensive glossy magazines, is mainly represented by international brands. The share of domestic companies in advertising fees only in rare cases reaches 30% ... so it was

Always".

Reference. In the gross income of magazines like CO ©) advertising gives 80%. The official reversal price in @@ is \$19,000.

"But there are Russian, and even Russian-patriotic industrial giants," some will think. - At least they will be stronger than Mercedes inside Russia.

Here's another trick for you. Yes, even if they were 100 times stronger than those vest-Rolux ones, this is the same... Remember the profile, the texture of our giants. Lukoil, Gazprom, Norilsk Nickel... What was called "group A goods" in the USSR. They are not interested in the mass consumer, they do not feel it. Their media support will be either unsystematic or even one-time.

Here's a patriotic (without a shadow of irony) Russian metallurgist thrown solid money into the media. But... to advertise from issue to issue products: rolled steel (oil, electricity) is, you see, a mockery. "Image return"? Conversations with the owners, their deputies, wives? In the same issue of The Bear (with the "sexual clock") there are interesting, lively conversations with Chubais and Alfred Koch. But this is another trap. The magazine, the readers, the glorified themselves will get tired of it - the only riddle: "Who will do it first?" Who will get sick of such "Frank Conversations" and "Portraits Against the Background" first?" My version of the answer: the one who is smarter.

Here, too, a peculiar line of split is outlined: "patriotic men's magazines" are about bosses, and P! auBow, Rep{Wotz\$e, @®, HHG. — about...

I see, as if in reality, this editorial planning meeting: "Our... patriot-oligarch poured into ... mln rub. us. We must also... Task: by... a quarter... of the year - to reach at least 6 self-sufficiency. Give!"

And to whom will they go for this self-sufficiency (remember: we are talking about a hypothetical patriotic men's magazine)? That's right: to the Mercedes Gillette! If not immediately to the "sexy watch"!

349

The conclusion of this theorem is that only producers of consumer products can be organically, steadily connected (not like Gusinsky's NTV with Gazprom!) with the media (after all, the second letter of "media" also means "mass").

Consequence: these segments - magazines that grow generations of loyal consumers of Western brands - must, firstly, be carefully distinguished (not only by these ugly abbreviated names, but also by the texture of the published advertising), and secondly, burdened with the most serious tax.

3. AND MORE ABOUT "THE INVISIBLE HAND OF THE MARKET," AND THE INVISIBLE WORLD'S MANABILITY (data from RBC Dayu, Itogi magazine)

1. Burda Publishing House publishes 22 monthly magazines + 7 weeklies + 6 published every 2 weeks.

Vigda, Joy, RyauBow, "Liza" ... The annual total circulation of publications is 3950 million copies. The consolidated turnover of Niben Vigda MeCh1a in 2006 was 2.31 billion euros.

General Director of the Burda publishing house Arnd-Volker Listevnik:

"You can only talk about real competition when you find ten magazines from the same segment in a kiosk... The Russian distribution system is one of the most expensive in the world. In Germany and Poland, distribution accounts for 30-35% of the final price for a product, in Russia - 50-60%.

In Germany, of course, there are also kiosks, they sell about 5% of the total turnover of press sales in the country, and the share of supermarkets is 35-40%. In Russia, we sell in supermarkets no more than 0.05%.

..Currently, the Russian market is undergoing a process of consolidation, as a result of which large structures are being formed... Of course, the volume of investments is changing, more and more investments are needed. Today it costs much more to launch a new magazine on the market than it did five or ten years ago. But we have new creative ideas that will develop the market.

350

2. Publishing house "Conde Nast" was founded in 1909 and unites the most elite and respected glossy magazines around the world. These are 90 magazines in 17 countries. WOSOE, OGAMOTSYU, a, Uaptsu Rush, Noise & Sagdep, Ags|cefiga! Plyue\$, Con4e Maz{ TraueYeg, Tre Me VorKer, \Mre4, Tke \Noop4 o! ý{epogv. 120 million readers.

Head of "Conde Nast" by Michael von Schlippe:

"In Russia, the publishers of popular men's magazines are annoyed by the presence of small-circulation publications. For years there are magazines that do not bring in money, and behind the covers of such publications someone's prestige or ambitions are hidden. The current situation worsens the competitive environment, as part of the readers spend money on these publications without buying magazines from "real publishers". Other obstacles that particularly deter potential foreign investors are low purchasing power and an imperfect infrastructure for the delivery of periodicals.

3. Sh4erep4dege MeFa, which calls itself a "Dutch private company", was created in 1992 specifically for activities in the Russian media market, the head is Derk Sauer. It publishes the newspapers Vedomosti, Tpe Mosso\m Titez, TBe \$1.PrchegzBige Tipez\$, the magazines Cult of Personalities, Domashniy Ochag, Kto! NeaTs, Mape Szaye... A total of 17 editions, with a total circulation of 1.8 million copies.

]M was recently accused by Mogazso Ra! ne (division no. ogazso Ho! 418\$, headquarters in London, president - citizen of India Ajay Goyal, publishes Tne Kizza oigpa |, [She Ze, Geadeg magazine. Total circulation - 75,000) in "unfair competition." The scandalous process, which included appeals to the FAS, was described in an article by Mogazso: "The Dutch concern

sh4derepayet Me4la VU has entered into a tacit agreement with leading publishers in Europe and the United States with the aim of using illegal methods to dominate the market for both English and Russian-language printed periodicals in Russia."

The company's CEO, Sandeep Goyal, was counting on the dismemberment of [pdepaen{ Me4a, a monopoly that controlled too much share (up to 60%, according to Mogazso) of the magazine market. Mogazso's argument: [p4erep4dep + Me4la - not

351

a unitary company, but a large holding company, which is not allowed to do what a small firm can do. "I'm ready to compete with Mozso/Tipez," exclaims Sandip Goyal. "But when advertising is sold as a package, with discounts in other editions of the cartel, when R]aubow is provided free of charge to subscribers of Mozso\Titez, this, sorry, is not for me. This is death for small and medium-sized publishers." In addition, according to Mr. Goyal, [M is poaching his advertisers by offering big discounts for not cooperating with Mogazso.

"The fact that all this is nonsense is obvious even without my comments," Mikhail Dubik, a member of the Board of Directors of the MeCh, said in turn. — Cooperation between publications of one publishing house in the field of marketing is a completely normal practice. But why should we give away our magazines for free to someone, for the production of which serious money has been spent? .." Shderepeen MeF also has something to say about competitors. According to Dubik, advertisers say that representatives of Kizcha Loigpa! offer them to remove ads from Mozso/Titez and put them in Kizcha Loigpa! on any conditions, "up to free placement".

Further, Itogi writes, Mogazso intends to apply to the US Department of Justice with the aim, as the company's statement says, "to achieve an investigation into the activities of monopoly practices, as a result of which ... economic obstacles are created for other American corporations to enter this (Russian) market..."

4. PLEASE ENOUGH

Indeed ... in an American court, an Indian accuses a Dutchman of monopolistic seizure of the Russian market! On such a shining pinnacle of globalism-liberalism, I would like to stop and take a breath. Further — only theses, digestible bits of information. How

known:

1. France ("free country", WTO member, etc.) has taxed every screening of a foreign (read: Hollywood) film. The proceeds go to support French cinema. The result is that the French are among the few who successfully compete with the United California Film Assembly Plants.

352

"Competitors" - if you understand the meaning of this pamphlet - is emphasized intentionally. Yes, against such cultural ... let's say better - media giants such tax support, like the French, is part of fair competition!

2. Starting from 2008, the current VAT exemptions for the media should be terminated. <... Russian publishers are looking for ways to lobby for the retention of tax benefits."

3. The Working Group on Legislative Initiatives of the National Press Coordinating Council (NCPC) held consultations on the taxation of print media. Chairman of the Commission of the Public Chamber on Communications, Information Policy and Freedom of Speech in the Mass Media P.N. Gusev reacted positively to the proposal to retain preferential VAT of 10% for the media.

4. Question. A state that has drawn, for example, the border between erotica/pornography and somehow follows (experts, lawyers, FAS) this difference, can it draw a line between real media and glossy catalogs of world brands (albeit with an admixture of texts "about the life of stars"? ""?)

5. And if it, the state, manages to calculate the sums of the areas of advertising modules, their share in the total volume of publications (compare the objectivity of this criterion with those in the case of erotica / pornography), will it then finally be able to figure out that the benefits intended for socially significant media and received today by glossy catalogs of world brands are... It is as if the subsidies of our Ministry of Agriculture intended for the grain growers of Siberia would go to the macarobs and marijuano growers of Afghanistan.

BREAKTHROUGH OUR PRO SYSTEM

No, do not be alarmed, the abbreviation from the subtitle is Anti-Advertising Defense. Although one should not be complacent either: a breakthrough of this defense, the deprivation of this immunity will come back to haunt not so quickly, but will become even more dangerous. It was said, "What's good for General Motors is good for America!" I will continue: "And what is good for the General, can it be bad for its glossy advertising platforms"?

353

And even earlier, 2000 years ago, it was also said: "For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also" (Luke 12:34).

Let me emphasize once again: this is not a quixotic fight against advertising! This is a fixation of a mathematical fact: there are segments where glossy magazines are 80–90% dependent on Western advertising. And such a degree of concentration, such a "transition of quantity into quality" should concern ... not only that Indian who figured out the existing monopoly of the Dutchman in the Russian market and sued an American court.

But this is not a petition to the state - on the state's omissions, they say: "Atu! These glamorous advertising catalogs will again extend the VAT exemption, worming their way into the social media! And the entrance fee charged by the agencies that own the stalls has become an insurmountable barrier for everyone who is not friends with Western tires and shampoos!"

But most of all, we ourselves are to blame for such a humiliating bias. First, a rule was put into circulation, sort of like a witticism: "If you are so smart, why are you so poor?" Then they missed the penetration of this rule into the sphere of mass information. And now, with childish naivete (any banality printed on the sparkling background of a Chrysler is already something!), with ridiculous snobbery, we leaf through pages that are pleasant to the touch, preferring to read any "abyrvalg" — but in glossy... and even in gloss, illuminated by flashes of street advertising and TV announcements ... Recipes from movie stars. Status!

Chapter 9

GEOPOLITICAL DARTS. DARTS OF "LOCAL CONFLICTS, IN TWO HEMISPHERES

Along with economic and ideological competition, the Cold War also unfolded on the fields of numerous "local conflicts". Struggle in ... as it was called - "countries of the third world".

Strictly speaking, from conflicts in the "second world" to this series of local most historians

refer only

354

GDR-West Berlin, and the events in Czechoslovakia-68, Hungary-56 are carried out according to a different article ...

Our self-irony reflected this in the shortest joke: "The United States is interfering in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union on all continents!"

Or in a fleeting phrase in the novel: "... in the meantime, the Marxist tribes completely surrounded the capital of the puppet government."

The number of these points of confrontation goes to many dozens, one can point to the monuments of the rightness of the USSR: Cuba, Vietnam continue to stand without our support. And you can turn to the most tragic mistake - Afghanistan. Here, from the American side, you are unlikely to notice at least some kind of self-irony. Only the iron equation of Charles Wilson (Mezych Charles Wilson), Texas congressman:

"We lost 58,000 in Vietnam. The Russians in Afghanistan lost 25,000. They owe us another 33,000 dead."

The slogan was launched like this: "Let the Russians have their own Vietnam!"

True, the same Charles Wilson shed tears (and many) "for the suffering of Afghan children who wounded his heart", knocking out money in Congress for "stingers" to shoot down Soviet helicopters. So all the same, compassion or that iron arithmetic of losses?

However, as they say, Charles Wilson underwent a heart transplant, so you can leave the mildest, most conciliatory option:

- In one of the congressman's hearts there was a calculation of those, still Vietnamese losses. "They owe us another 33,000 dead."

And in another congressman's heart - yes, compassion for the Afghans. True, it turns out, according to Charles Wilson's arithmetic, that in order to successfully "collect" the remainder of this debt (33,000 killed), the Afghan war would have to drag on for a few extra years.

But the most important amendment is elsewhere. Vietnam... Wilson did not study very well: second from the end in terms of exam results (history), eighth from the end - in the end.

355

And it is almost excusable for him not to know that the Vietnamese knot dragged on even in his school years. And the USSR had nothing to do with this. Yes, the USSR then filled up North Vietnam with mountains of weapons! Yes, the future challenger McCain was shot down by a Soviet missile.

BUT ... the USSR did not provoke the United States to get into Vietnam.

The Vietnam conflict is, in fact, a 99% French colonial war that split the country into the North and the South in the very early 1950s.

But the rout of the French on May 7, 1954 at Dien Bien Phu, which sounded to the whole world, was too loud, for some reason prompted the United States to take the vacant French place.

This is the main difference between Vietnam and Afghanistan brought together in a single Wilsonian balance! And the whole authentic Afghan chronicle requires finally turning to one of the most iconic figures of the Cold War...

ZBIGNIEW BRZHEZINSKI

Events, generally speaking, are so close that they are the sphere not even of historians, but of politicians. And - I really hope so! - also the sphere of international lawyers. And then given

the fragment can be considered as a draft statement of claim for the creation of an analogue of the Hague Tribunal.

What is the specificity of the situation? Including the specificity of what is meant by \$ muep4!, which gave legitimacy and life (and financial security!) to the same Gzagsky ... "International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law perpetrated on the territory of the former Yugoslavia since 1991" is nevertheless perceived by liberals, humanists, and human rights activists as something very cautious, in the spirit of our well-known proverb "if only there was no war".

It seems that it is believed that there are some higher values of humanism, more important than state sovereignty, and in the name of these values it is possible to arrest and try officials who acted within the laws of their countries. But the range of application of these values is outlined so cautiously, as if

356

trembling hand of Khoma Brutus, that a certain fresh look is required for everyone to marvel at the strangeness of this figure ...

And here we can say that National Security Adviser to US President Jimmy Carter set himself up big, publicly, in front of the whole world, admitting that it was he who lured the USSR into the "Afghan trap." That is, he took the first step to unleash the Afghan conflict.

As you know, on December 24, 1979, Soviet troops entered Afghanistan.

But as early as July 3, 1979, as Brzezinski himself testifies, he sent a memorandum to the president, in which he expressed the opinion that "assistance to the opponents of the Afghan regime (Karmal-Amin) will encourage the Soviet Union to military intervention" . And President Carter signed the first directive to provide clandestine assistance to opponents of the regime in Kabul.

This is what then-CIA director Robert Gates confirms in his memoirs:

"... the American intelligence service supported the Mujahideen six months before the dramatic turn of events (the entry of Soviet troops) took place."

And Brzezinski himself stated this quite openly in an interview with the French newspaper *Mötsue!* Obzeguzheig (January 18-25, 1998). And a little earlier in an interview with the SMM television network (June 13, 1997).

The formal revelation was that earlier, according to the American version, their assistance to the Mujahideen began after December 24, 1979. And now Robert Gates and others have acknowledged, and Brzezinski has even boasted that the aid had begun on July 3, 1979, precisely with the aim of provoking the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Nouvel Observater: Do you regret that you promoted Islamic fundamentalism, that you supplied weapons and advised future terrorists?

3. Brzezinski (as the French interviewers note, he is surprised):

This covert operation was a great idea. Its purpose was to lure the Russians into an Afghan trap, and you want me to regret it?

357

What is more important in terms of the history of the world? Taliban or the fall of the Soviet empire? (...)

Further, the United States developed a list of sanctions and other measures aimed at making the USSR pay a "big price" for the adventure they inspired. Brzezinski personally visited Pakistan in order to coordinate joint efforts with this Muslim country and draw "Saudi, Egyptians, British, Chinese" into the anti-Soviet axis.

In general, the fact of the American provocation that framed the USSR has long been established. Member of the European Parliament Julietto Chiesa also drew attention to this fact. However, the insanity of the Brezhnev leadership, which succumbed to not the most cunning feint, is the same established constant.

Now I'm just placing some accents, but I'll ask some questions.

The first question is the European Union.

Are the criteria of humanism really superior to state sovereignties? Or was it only the sovereignty of the United States was higher than the sovereignty of Yugoslavia?

If yes, then why don't you have any questions to the father of the Taliban and Al-Qaeda, to the man who publicly boasts of his role in unleashing the Afghan conflict?

The second question is the USA.

How does the announced "reset" of your relations with Russia correlate with the fact that President Obama has an adviser, Zbigniew Brzezinski?

The third question is for the whole world.

As you know, the Baptist preacher, later US President Jimmy Carter, was indeed a meek, peace-loving politician. He was not even afraid of being considered ridiculous, sending naive "peace letters" to the heads of the largest countries of the world, receiving in response ridicule not only from the USSR, but also from the allies.

And now... this actual carrying out by the Baptist Carter - the policy of... the Jesuit Brzezinski - isn't it a warning to the whole world - about the future stability of the line of another president, equally personally sympathetic, equally democrat, but having the same adviser? !

358

Note. For comparing Zbig Brzezinski with a Jesuit, of course, one should apologize to the current heirs of Ignatius Loyola. Here this word is present, rather, as a kind of stamp, a popular image.

But the lack of a more suitable, worthy term for likening this politician to him is not should stop.

The appearance of this character on my pages is by no means accidental. Today Ukraine is the sphere of his closest interests. There are dozens of his articles hitting exactly this point. Among the most resonant can be listed:

Brzezinski: "Moscow, with the help of Ukraine, is creating a new Soviet Union, new elections are needed" (this is just about the unique three-round performance with the nomination of Yushchenko. This book began with what);

Zbigniew Brzezinski: "America's romance with Putin is over";

Brzezinski: "The West needs to cool relations with the Kremlin";

Zbigniew Brzezinski: "Imperial Russia, vassal Ukraine".

But the most symptomatic and sympathetic performance deserves a separate study. This is his big Ukrainian interview:

The great chessboard of Zbigniew Brzezinski ("Mirror of the Week", Ukraine, March 28, 2008).

With the subtitle: "On March 28, the author of the idea of the collapse of the USSR turns 80 years old."

Arkady Sidoruk is interviewing, here is his inspired beginning:

— Thinking about how to write an anniversary article dedicated to Zbigniew Brzezinski, I tried to get rid of the human tendency to subjectivism. But I didn't manage to do it completely, and here's why. My first serious professional test while working as an ITAR-TASS correspondent in Washington was an interview on the first anniversary of the victory of the new Russian revolution in August 1992. Correspondence acquaintance turned out to be a pleasant surprise: after returning to America from the former Soviet

359

Soyuz Brzezinski struck me, besides his intellect, with his etiquette. I remember I called the Center for Strategic and International Studies. The answer was disappointing. His assistant, Trudy Warner, said Mr. Brzezinski was not there. As it turns out, he was then finishing work on the future political bestseller *Out of Control: Global Chaos on the Eve of the 20th Century*. And, despite being busy, less than half an hour later, his phone rang in the ITAR-TASS office.

What arrogant "sovbur" or a representative of the new democratic "elite" in Russia or Ukraine, insolent, barely hatched from an egg, is capable of such an act? And which of them is interested in the opinion of someone who is on a lower level. Is that your own, heard from the flattering lips of others. And which of them will say, like Zbigniew Brzezinski: "I completely agree with you" or ask: "What do you think?"...

So Sidoruk childishly rejoices at the attention (call) of Brzezinski. The very same conversation led him to complete ecstasy.

His exclusive interviews lasted a maximum of 25 minutes. It seems that he highly appreciates journalistic [©]. During this time, Brzezinski managed to succinctly express many original thoughts and substantiate them. His phrases resembled mathematical formulas and clung to each other like the wheels of a clock. The clarity of thought was amazing.

Communication with Brzezinski was remembered by me as one of the greatest intellectual pleasures in my life...

Some may reproach Brzezinski for "nurturing" the Mujahideen on his own head... Nevertheless, he can rightly consider himself a triumphant. The senseless adventure into which he dragged the senile Kremlin leaders turned into a complete fiasco for the Kremlin. Communism was also defeated in another region. The Berlin Wall fell, and Solidarity won in Poland. The implementation of the Brzezinski doctrine of "peaceful rapprochement with Eastern Europe" completely crossed out the Yalta agreements, made it possible for the peoples liberated from the communist regime to return to the bosom of democracy...

360

80-year-old Zbigniew Brzezinski is one of those who in the last quarter of the 20th century determined the face of the world. The last and most important creation of his creative mind was the concept of NATO expansion to the East. Developed during the presidency of Bill Clinton, it was coolly received in the White House, where they did not want to irritate Russia. Those who know the secrets of Washington cuisine know that Brzezinski finally managed to "push" it through the then adviser to the

National Security Officer Anthony Lake. The process has begun and continues to this day (...)

What can you say? You are right, Arkady, mentally comparing Brzezinski's mobility, contact with... an arrogant "sovbur" or a representative of the newly-minted democratic "elite" in Russia or Ukraine, insolent, barely hatched from an egg.

And three times right about the senile Kremlin leaders.

Yes, only criticism of some, which really helps to push off, giving a certain impetus, will it really help to understand others? Their true intentions? Remember, Arkady, at least Kostomarov, the foremost "Ukrainophile" and hater of Russia: "... the Poles wanted to be sucked into Russia, as they had previously been sucked into Ukraine."

And remember, Arkady, at least 2 more important numbers:

in the Russian Empire there are 610,000 hereditary nobles of both sexes. Of these, 323,000 are Polish gentry (A. Romanovich-Slavatinsky. "Nobility in Russia." 2nd ed. Kiev, 1912. P. 535).

I calculated, Arkady: it turns out that 53% of the nobles of the Russian Empire were Poles! And the bottom of this unique social pyramid - serfs, cattle (the official term in the letters of Brzezinski's ancestors, describing your, A. Sidoruk, ancestors) constituted the main goal of "absorption". NOT conquests, NOT subjugations, but exactly... Re-read the story of how Poles hookers coaxed the Cossack Ivan Gonta: "May you protect US from you!" Maybe you will stop admiring the courtesy, tenderness of Pan Zbigniew - just a biological detail: yes, a leech - she is not a wolf, she does not growl.

361

Here is a funny analogy, Arkady... In "Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka" Patsyuk says to Vakula: "He doesn't have to look for the devil for a long time, who has the devil behind him..."

This smacking and other pleasant sounds of a sucking leech, they, Arkady, are on your recorder. And, accordingly, in your article.

Brzezinski:

"I like Ukraine. I am happy to see her independent. Perhaps the influence of parents plays a role in this. I was born in Poland... And my father fought for Polish independence, he also fought against the Ukrainians in the city that he used to call Lwow, and the Ukrainians call Lvov, in the city of which I am an honorary citizen. When I was growing up, my father often told me that that conflict between Ukrainians and Poles was pointless... depriving both peoples of their independence. I have always enjoyed visiting Ukraine. I like Ukrainians. I like some Ukrainian politicians (...)"

Conclusion of the interlocutor, Arkady Sidoruk: "Brzezinski has never been indifferent to Ukraine. One of the reasons for this is a personal, sentimental attitude towards her ... "

Maybe Arkady. Personally, this passage about Brzezinski's sentimentality made me think hard. Even about some important human psychological constants and laws of the world order...

However, Brzezinski also has this passage:

3. Brzezinski: "I have always liked Russians, I admire your country."

This pearl is still "hanging" on the site: "VVSUizyaap. hundred", and this server has not yet melted down.

Yes... It looks like Zbigniew is an atheist, and he is not at all afraid of the drying up of the tongue on this phrase, the lightning strike, the opening of the earth...

True, he also has another phrase - now you can listen to it ... in any case, without spasms of disgust:

"A new world order under US hegemony is being created against Russia, at the expense of Russia and on the ruins of Russia," Zbigniew Brzezinski.

362

And what do you think, Arkady, when Brzezinski, who outplayed and... dragged the senile Kremlin leaders into the Afghan slaughter, went to Pakistan to gather and instruct the Mujahideen, what did he say to them? Is it something other than:

"I like Afghanistan. I like all... Afghan people. I love Pashtun politicians. I admire your customs. I am happy to see you..." etc.

But it was precisely his then cunning, and even the insanity of Brezhnev, that ensured Afghanistan that war ...

In general, if he got into security advisers and to Mahatma Gandhi himself, I'm afraid he would have carried out similar tricks there, bringing the policy of India closer to that of Hitler's Germany.

Or, in relation to public organizations, if he gets a job in the fund and with Mother Teresa herself, al-Qaeda will come out ... which he already got out of ... however, then it got out of control - but that's all. anyway, where are the questions of humanists, human rights activists, international lawyers - to its creator?

Chapter 10

SO DID THIS "COLD WARRIOR" END OR NOT?

An interesting, and even the most pressing question, for the sake of answering which, in fact, the book is worth start...

Of course it's over! Even several times. From this "warring" side, those key sets of WORDS are perfectly remembered:

— "Peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems" (this is almost from the Khrushchev era);

- "Detente" (classic of the Brezhnev period);

— "Delsic peace process" (and there is also a specific, well-known date: the summer of 1975)...

... Well, and further, all these peaceful turns, historical world milestones, including the most famous:

363

- "New Thinking" (here the memories, of course, are more recent and sharp to the point of heartburn).

That is, almost every historic visit, summit meeting, summit ... and some purely intra-union actions: congresses, new party programs, new constitutions of the country ... tended, among other things, to end this very Cold War. And let's not limit ourselves to this "belligerent side", events and actions also took place south of Canada, positioning some Presidents as:

- Winners of the Cold War

the winners in the Cold War.

But the sheer number of endings of the war... each of the announced endings of the war evoked understandable thoughts. That, in any case, the previous end of the war was not quite the final end ... And of the two victorious presidents, at least (!) One - wears his wreath undeservedly.

From the number of TV talks, discussions of my "Second World War. Reloaded" I remember most of all a conversation, maybe even an argument, with Igor Desyatnikov, in his program "The Tenth Wave", on one satellite channel, in my opinion, a bit like the "Russian Discovery". I remember the obvious incompleteness. As a matter of fact, we had no disagreements about the Second World War itself, about this notorious Munich summit that unleashed it. But, moving on to the "consequences", to all these painted "United Europes" (Berlin and Brussels), Desyatnikov, suspecting, perhaps, of me ... well, if not a "revanchist hawk", then simply - The writer, conveniently registered in the confrontational system, in this very "cold war", began to elicit: how do I feel about globalism?

Moreover, the conversation turned out to be absolutely sincere, and Desyatnikov fully recognized the correctness of some of the accusations against Euro-hypocrites, and these politicians ... south of Canada (sorry, by the end of the book, some political geographic names are simply boring) - Desyatnikov fully recognized. But regarding the way out of the confrontation... he recognized globalism as such. I remember one of his arguments almost literally, it was quite formulated:

364

helium, the basis of development and all life is Love. The hour of conversation, in general, was coming to an end, and I answered somewhat formally, saying that, according to the same Gospel, the global Government is an exact sign of the Apocalypse, the end of the world. So, globalism will lead us to... and so on. But then I couldn't attach this well-known fact to the topic of conversation, mumbled something like "... it's interesting that you raise a question, thank you ... this requires separate reflections ...".

Indeed, it is easy to become such a "confrontational" writer, using the energy of repulsion, opposition. From the Second World War to the "Cold War", then to come up with some other "war", to become its "troubadour", if not "arsonist" (quite magazine crocodile terms)...

Indeed, it is more difficult, but also more worthy to give an example of self-restraint, which was shown by the same President Eisenhower, who was already being set as a model. Which, in addition to the successful pacification in Korea and Sinai, gave the famous, much-discussed warning about the power of the military-industrial complex to lobby for any war. And after all, it was said to them, as you know, about their own, the American military-industrial complex.

Reply for symmetry - with a similar warning about your VIC? In general, such warnings (about the terrible threat of the Soviet, Russian military-industrial complex) were made by various short nuikins. Moreover, these warnings were practically their main job (and source of income). But the humility with which our VIC switched to that same idiotic, almost ritual production of pots and titanium shovels (the famous "conversion"), and this happened at the will of ... even such a president as ... Gorbachev! And then this VIC of ours completely reset itself, closed factories, institutes, thereby proving, albeit "from the contrary", that comparing it in the "Eisenhower, lobbying" sense with a colleague - the American VIC - is ... If this is about says something, but only about the personality of those short-haired Nuikins who frightened us with them.

In general, the most difficult, difficult question that appeared to me during the discussions on the "Reset" was the one about the relationship between love as a common mover and confrontation - the same "cold wars ...

365

And a few months after this conversation, at the time of the completion of this book on the Second World War and the Cold War, I can only answer ... approximately the following. For Love, as a common source of the development of life, some kind of separation, separation, delimitation is still needed. Someone separate loves someone separate. Potential difference, plus and minus. Of course, there is this trend, now glorified by many, of universal merging and mixing.

Let's say a popular topic is same-sex marriage. But the floor is not the penis. Sex is a fact of difference. In this sense, same-sex marriages may well be called asexual. And it's not about feelings (Oscar Wilde to the Lord... it doesn't matter, or Elton John to... it doesn't matter). And about the fact that Love, entering social structures, in order to remain a creative engine, requires... It seems that theologians meet this: inseparability-inseparability.

What does the lack of consistency at the state level remind us of, if, for example, we take our Cold War adversary? Where were the initial creative impulses born, from among those that gave something of world cultural significance? Cinema (real!) - Italians, Jews. Music - mainly those who came there in chains. Latin culture is also a beautiful culture. Nationally divided - gave rise to creative impulses. And from the already mixed, homogenized environment, from the actual nation of OZA-evtsy, was born ... except for that off-screen laughter recorded for comic series, marking the places where

laugh...

In general, just as the USSR was once called (positioned) "Congo with missiles", or, I remember, there was a variant of "Upper Volta with missiles", the US itself can also be positioned: cultural Antarctica.

And ... the result. Mixing into a single mass, a global paste seems to me worse than even a moderate Cold War. At least we know by whom and how this war was managed. In a sense, countries in the era of separation have and had a completely familiar, studied, imaginable ... human structure ...

And we just touched on the main subjects, actors of the "cold war" a page above. Yes, they were feared, horrified, but the fact that they, having power and choice, did not go to the destruction of mankind, proves, in general, them, these

366

structures, if not "humanity" (this term - the equivalent of "humanity" - has already been staked out by the humanities), then, in any case, human likeness, permeation with completely human values (preservation: life ...). And what will govern the global human pasta is another big question.

But the phenomenon of the fact that it was the "military" that did not allow a world nuclear war is the subject of the chapter "An Equation with an Unknown Number of Unknowns".

Briefly surveying the actors, carriers of threats in the Cold War, we mentioned on the American side the VIC and Eisenhower's warning about his lobbying, financial power. They also talked about the Soviet VIC (which dutifully switched to the production of titanium shovels - that would be a real exhibit for the Cold War Museum in Fulton, Missouri).

So it was not the military-industrial complex, rather, our ideological sphere was the source of a certain danger to the world, but here it would be incorrect to confine ourselves to this statement without understanding when, to whom and with what our "ideological department" threatened. Briefly, there are 3 periods.

1. When: approximately until the period of overcoming Trotskyism.

To: everyone.

What: the same "world" or "permanent" revolution.

2. When: approximately from 1925 to 1975. That is, from the curtailment of the "world revolution" to focusing on one's own problems ("building" turned out to be much more difficult than "conquering") – and up to Brezhnev's "acme".

To whom: mainly to the "first world" (Europe - USA).

Than: practically - very little than threatening. That is, ideologically, it was, in fact, defense.

An explanation is needed here.

They built socialism in a "single country", then - in a "single camp". This expansion, mind you, is by no means the result of a successful ideological expansion!

Suppose, without a world war, we would raise Polish, Czech ... communists and grow up to seize power in their countries. This would be one option. But in fact, there was a variant - a purely "tank". invaded us

367

Germany (and Europe) has paid the price with East Germany (and, accordingly, with Eastern Europe). Legal, recognized in Yalta "buffer", security sphere. I repeat for the hundredth time: those who fought for an hour and a half and lost 36 people (this is still the same Denmark, but there were countries that resisted EVEN less! 4 years and lost dozens

million...

So, equipping its "buffer" and in need of stable frontiers, a "fence around the construction site", the USSR ideologically left the "first world" to itself. Perhaps indeed relying on "intra-imperialist contradictions", Churchill captured this very accurately when he said: "The Soviets were a malevolent witness." Yes, thrice malevolent - but a witness. Periodic residence of Western communists in our country is no more a crime than the residence of Ayatollah Khomeini near Paris. A typical example is that Stalin supported the British Communists when they switched to a purely parliamentary track.

Second explanation. Regarding the addressee of this "gloating", self-eliminated policy. Indeed, only the "first world". Yes, the "third world", in fact, arose during this period of our "defense": the collapse of the world colonial system.

3. When: from Brezhnev's "acme" (the period of his highest achievements, 1975, Helsinki) - and then, of course, - down. Then later general secretaries, the first President.

To whom: the same as in the 1st period - to everyone. Than: generally speaking - with its vacuum. If the first period is a world revolution, the second

The "separately taken" construction of socialism and the security fence around it, what's next ... Actually, the explosion of this "vacuum bomb" in the head of our collective helmsman detonated Afghan, Belovezhye ...

I would not like to end my history of the Cold War on this note, but the most optimistic positions were expressed by me in the chapter "An Equation with an Unknown Number of Unknowns". I will not repeat them, especially since all subsequent chapters, and even a simple glance, looking up from the book, out the window will confirm to you that this "Equation ..." has been solved.

Application GEOPOLITICS AND ALL SUCH...

(History of the Second World War - in fifty text messages)

The dual experience of doing R-actions and teaching at the same university tells me that I need to take care of the shortest version of the story "traversed" in this book. Today, both the Consumer and the Student demand a summary. And not just short, but also peculiarly pulsating. And, if you want to be perceived, you must somehow rhythmically correspond to the modern informational style ("The future depends on you", "Control the dream", etc.).

Therefore, the entire content of this book is presented in the form of 0 slogans, short theses, available, including for communication in the \$5M format.

1. Adolf Hitler - trust manager of ZAO Evropa.
2. How many days did the Škoda and ěKD factories stand idle due to the flag change?
3. Before the Soviet tanks of 1968 in Prague, there were Czech tanks in Minsk, Smolensk and Stalingrad.
4. The moral responsibility of the Skoda team is easier even than their light tanks.
- O. The Euroaesthetics were afraid that the drunken President-conductor would try his hand at the anniversary parade - also with a drum major.
6. The French, at \$250 per barrel, will invite Kuwait and the Emirates as heroes of the Second Front.
7. England was engaged in "dubious fleets", the USSR - "dubious republics".
8. First, Strasbourg, Prague and Vilnius must be liberated, so that smart people can settle there, who will tell you according to what rules they should be released and what fines are due for violation of these rules.

369

9. The German Kaiser was not "their son of a bitch", so go ahead, liberals! "Long live the Weimar Republic!" And so it went.
10. As if on the Borodino field, our and the French infantry fought furiously for flashes, and nearby the cavalymen of Murat and Uvarov arranged joint concerts and presentations.
11. The championship in Aryanism was won by the children's team of Russia, and the youth team lost (with the sole refereeing of the Fuhrer).
12. ...and for three days in September 2001] the "rogue state" was the United States of America.
13. We just need a different model for using Rezun. A well-known example: a pig is released into a truffle field, the pig searches, picks off truffles, but this is where the cooperation ends. A person finds another use for the truffle, different from the desires of a grunting employee.
14. The new Judas does not hang himself, but adds to thirty - also thirty-first, second, third ... pieces of silver - for "Memories of the Garden of Gethsemane." And then also the thirty-sixth, seventh for "Corrections to Reminiscences".
15. The preface to The Icebreaker was written by Bukovsky, if you remember one, delivered to the West by barter.
16. The "Big War" itself takes command.

17. "Churchill is a conformist!" It is hard to imagine something more incompatible (like: "Kolobok Rezun ran not from the GRU, but from the Bolshoi Ballet").

18. So, lovers of simple evidence: "A Short Course in the History of the CPSU (b)" and the British Prime Minister and historian Churchill are absolutely unanimous in their interpretation and assessment of the events of 1939 of the year".

19. Swedish "neutrality" turned out to be the best anti-aircraft defense of the Reich's supply routes.

20. The author seemed to be walking with a voice recorder through the streets of Berlin in the thirties.

21. Marabini testifies: in 1932 German Jews were more afraid of the Communists than of Hitler.

22. By the way, Ingvar Kamprad, later the founder of the worldwide IKRA network, also marched in Nordisk Ungdum (Northern Youth). (I have an idea!)

370

23. Ersatz beer was made on the basis of dairy production waste. Drinking it was, of course, the most difficult, perhaps unbearable test for the "Aryan spirit."

24. The most imaginable Resistance heroes are Keanu Reeves and his girlfriend in The Matrix.

25. The level of Hitler's violence: perhaps there will still be many attempts to even exaggerate it in order to hide behind it, to hide a share of completely mutually beneficial market relations.

26. Not only orders, but also orders went to Denmark, Norway, the Czech Republic, France.

27. It was in Buchenwald and Majdanek that shackles rang, and in "United Europe" coins rang.

28. "Munich" of the 15th century was in Constance. Jan Hus went to the church cathedral with guarantees of inviolability from Emperor Sigismund of Luxembourg. Chamberlain's guarantees have a rich background!

29. Defenestration, execution by throwing out of a window, is a Czech invention. Apparently, this is due to the success of multi-storey construction in Prague.

30. Previously, part of the Sudetenland was called the "Giant Mountains". Controversial minority - "Giant Germans".

31. In March 1939, Polyna will receive from the Czech heritage the highly developed Teshinsky district, and literally six months later, in September, everything else due.

32. The nation of Jan Hus and Georgy Podebrad was betrayed by the Europe of Knights of the Garter and Nobel Peace Prize winners.

33. "Fifth column" ... Doesn't it remind you of the "fifth corner"? As she was born on the pages of newspapers in 1937, she basically marched there.

34. The only successful Nazi "fifth column" was the Sudetenland. And that was only because she had such "column leaders" as Chamberlain, Halifax, Daladier.

35. Among all the ideas, the one that has the brightest "video sequence" is selected. Better passable on the TV screen.

36. A replica of the hero is remembered. Or at least the actor who played that hero. Or at least someone from the film crew.

37. US Senators apologized for the slave trade, the Pope apologized for the Crusades. The Germans are for

371

Holocaust. Then - the dish was sent around the circle - to the Turks to apologize for 1915, but for us, of course, more: for 1940, and for 1956, and for 1968 ...

38. The current president of tiny Macedonia apologizes to half the world for the campaigns of Alexander the Great. Tomorrow Tunisia will send its apologies to Italy "for the genocide at Cannae ... and for the entire campaign of Hannibal" (the Bedouins are even flattered by their involvement in world history).

39. What if... and in Russia a politician will turn up who will apologize, and even on New Year's Eve, how can I send two bytes? So, with these apologies, you can get into very real money - they are called "reparations".

40. War has always brought peace closer. Peace brought war closer. And always the "post-war years" slowly turned into "pre-war years".

41. United Europe-2 (Brussels) must recognize one simple historical fact — its continuity with United Europe-1 (Berlin). Except, of course, Great Britain and Russia.

42. Norwegian sailors (and coastal forces) sink the German cruisers, and the air base surrenders to fighter crews. And then the whole capital "accepts the parade" of five landing companies. It looks more like the expeditions of Cortes.

43. The German Georg Ohm taught us how to measure electrical resistance. How and how to measure the resistance to the Germans in World War II?

44. An avenger is not yet a defender. The defender carries the weapon openly. And it is possible to protect (shield, stand between the defended and the enemy) only openly. Revenge - whatever.

45. "The Great War" "does not come in a conspicuous way."

46. We return "to the front line" some participants, reminding them on which side they acted.

47. That the sins of war of the liberators will be remembered, and the benefits of liberation forgotten, is entirely in the nature of man.

48. It is impossible to operate with the results of the world war in terms of modern politically correct hangouts.

Afterword

WAIT FOR THE BABY, DEVIL?

I don't mean those proverbial devils, any of whom yearn to associate with an infant. And not the baby who, to the delight of all the devils, shouted that the king was naked. I mean the historian Igor Shumeiko, who in his book "World War II. Reloaded" remarked (more with the sarcasm of a pamphleteer than with the equanimity of a scholar):

"...This is, in fact, the advantage of a one-year-old baby over an old man..."

The old people who remember the "Great War" are in the captivity of their memory. They are dying. Babies, free from such a memory, grow up. They can twist the past however they want.

What to expect from a historian who was a one-year-old baby, when the Power, freed from the grave fear of the deceased Supreme [Commander-in-Chief,] began to slide off to nowhere, but it became clear when the babies entered adulthood and inherited not the Power, and its broken pieces. And instead of the Victory, there was a list of claims from small peoples who suffered during the "Great WAR".

By model:

"You, Russians, of course, drove out the Nazis, but you also hurt the local residents, if you please apologize and pay for the broken pots. [citizenship in the newly independent states do not wait! You are now in the minority!

As expected, the American president stands up for the protection of the rights of the Russian minority: he does not forgive the infringement of minorities even [to Hitler.

The former baby, a dozen years late to be born for the Victory, picks up with insidious humor: what, the meaning of the Great War and Victory is the worldwide assertion of the rights of minorities? Andersen's child would appreciate such a

373

stake: today's globalists see the world as a herd of communities (countries, nations, confessions), which must be pastured; the opponents of globalism are ready to save from the world shepherds just such a motley world of minorities.

But then you can't remember the "Great War" by anything else, except for belated accounts. Everyone is small, and everyone is crippled, but who was gutted there first - who can remember? Americans, for example (true "babies" of New History), when asked who fought in World War II, sometimes take a long time to figure out which side Hitler was on. And we remember this guest well, but for us he gradually merges with Napoleon and other adversaries of the Fatherland. What to do: and Guderian's tanks in the mists of time will eventually become something like Hannibal's elephants.

So, against this background, the research of the young historian Igor Shumeiko is striking in its thorough, scrupulous knowledge of the facts of the war, which he did not catch. And in general the facts of history. Figuratively speaking, from Horace to Grotius - if about the thickness of time. And if it's about recent history, then in the full breadth of impenetrable rubble, because "so much has been said and written that if a middle-aged person now decides to give up everything and only studies memoirs and dissertations on this topic, he will be provided with reading for two lives. forward".

Yes. If you read the way a ram reads the inscriptions on the new gates. If you read, knowing why you read, you can understand something in one life, in the "middle age" of which Igor Shumeiko now lives. Although the facts themselves are stubbornly interesting things. For example, the famous speech of Churchill in Fulton (the full text of which in a fresh translation from English is given by Shumeiko - for the first time in our press). Or - a document of a different sight, from those that were first hammered into our consciousness, and then swept away with a new broom (Stalin's answers to Pravda's questions about Churchill's speech).

Some facts are seen from an angle that is unusual for us. For example, the number of tanks made in Czech factories that reached Stalingrad... If I had known, I would have found something to answer in 1988 to the Czech exiles, who demanded an answer from me why Soviet tanks reached Prague in 1968.

374

Some facts, in general, seem to have been introduced into our journalistic circulation for the first time. For example, the battle of 1940 at Mers-el-Kebira, when the British sent the French fleet (along with sailors) to the bottom in order to. these ships were not captured by the Germans who were defeating the French. If I had known, I would have found something to answer to the Balts who were separating from us, whose independence was sunk to the bottom by the Red Army in the same 1940, so that their territory would not fall to the Nazis.

However, Igor Shumeiko himself knows how to ask tricky questions to his opponents, in which double standards are turned inside out and back on their face, and this face appears in "primordial origin". You need to be able to do this, and the author of the book "World War II. Reboot" can do it. He is bright, biting, resourceful. The talent of the polemicist here is so obvious (and so seductive) that the author sometimes clearly indulges in temptation, and then, getting involved in an exchange of injections, manages to whisper to serious readers that this, of course, is a pamphlet, and he, Shumeiko, is understands.

Pamphlet poison — from the need to translate the realities of the "Great War" into the language of the modern world — the world of minorities, buzzing with the demands of political correctness.

Smarties - another portion of poison:

"...Perhaps Stalin really should have somehow organized a communication session and consulted with Havel, Landsbergis, Clinton and Madeleine Albright: how should the Great War be waged? »

Force Vaclav Havel (who lost his hereditary factories in the Czech Republic), or Madeleine Albright (a girl who survived the invasion of the Germans in the same Czech Republic, and then the Russians), or Landsbergis (who, for the sake of politics, had to digress from research on jürlionis), and even more so Clinton to answer for the fact that they feel sorry for those who 60 years ago fell "under the arm" is, of course, a purely literary move on the part of Shumeiko: None of them will react to such promptings. But Rezun and Bukovsky, perhaps, will answer, and in the same pamphlet style, and then the exchange of rudeness will continue, during which those cardinal ideas that Shumeiko proposes to comprehend may be buried.

While paying tribute to the informative density and stylistic brilliance of his book, I still think that the main thing in it is precisely the proposed ideas.

375

The first idea: to take a fresh look at the European map of 1941, where "everything is literally smeared with brown paint", and therefore distinguish in this those who entered into an alliance with Germany (Italy, Finland, Hungary, Romania, Bolsheviks). - garia), those who were captured (France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Gecia...). And inside the occupied Europe "the Poles fought, left the ruins to the Germans, the Czechs handed over themselves intact...". In Yugoslavia, the Serbs are fighting to the death, the Croats are also fighting to the death, but on the German side (they even rename themselves Goths so that nothing Slavic remains). It is possible to compile a comparative table according to the degree of resistance to Hitler... and then, despite all the ethnic alignments, the main anti-fascists will turn out to be... the Germans themselves! Of course, the pro-Bolshevik "Red Chapel" and the pro-general "Black Chapel" are diametrically opposed in terms of long-range goals, but in terms of the degree of damage inflicted on Hitler, they stand side by side: there is a confession by Goering (at the Nuremberg trials) that the "Red Chapel" was worth Germany lost ten divisions; and there is Churchill's admission (in his memoirs) that Czechoslovakia's refusal to resist cost the Allies the loss of thirty-five divisions. Pretty comparable numbers...

"The Norwegians resisted much longer, but they were helped by the landscape of the country, and the English landings and fleet. The Dutch are closer to the Danish version. Belgians are closer to Norwegian. Luxembourg - two wounded (probably someone slipped).

I leave the last assumption on the conscience of not a historian, but a pamphleteer... and the historian's idea of drawing a map of interwar Europe in a new way is as striking in its unexpected insight as the cry of Andersen's child. Isn't some unknown, previously hidden structure of reality exposed here?

And if you superimpose the map of 1941 on the map of 1914? There is the Entente, here ... also the Entente?

What if we superimpose the map of 1941 (Hitler's Europe) on the map of 1991? The same Europe will work out, only the capital was moved from Berlin to Brussels.

And again, through a sarcastic grin, you catch a sharp look, and reality emerges from under the usual (including Marxist textbooks) clothes: there "the imperialists

376

"revanchist bloc", here and there the people, united in language and ethnic origin, subject to pressure from different blocs, breaks up to the nearest micron into the same warring parts: with each new shake-up, Croats and Serbs - enemies. One can, of course, attribute their enmity to the confessional incongruity between Catholicism and Orthodoxy, but only Catholic Poles laid down their bones fighting against [Hitler, and Orthodox Romanians recruited him to the Russian front no, but soldiers. Where is the logic?

There is no logic. Neither in social nor in confessional schemes. There is a mysterious, not yet understood reality under all these schemes. Talk about the form of government and about different ideals (democracy, communism, the proletariat, the bourgeoisie) is all, as Shumeiko writes, a "smoke screen", but the essence is that in these different systems (blocs) both in 1914 and in 1941 and 1991 are all the same people. That is, peoples.

It is they who decide where the country (system) will fall in the next split of the continent. And how long will the country resist (if any). Sometimes neighboring (or even kindred) peoples find themselves on different sides of the next demarcation. Belarus-Ukraine... There is reason to gasp for the ideologists of Slavic unity. Armenia-Georgia... But in what terrible dream could the antagonism of Russians and Georgians be seen?

No, these new dividing lines do not lend themselves to any customary logic if we regard the world as a heap of small peoples (inescapable "minorities" in relation to the mass of humanity) that only accidentally fall (and are forcibly driven) into blocs, systems, empires and commonwealths.

If, however, these associations are recognized as the same ethno-political, geopolitical and psychopolitical reality as the "heap" in which they must seek support, then the lines of tension between systems should be considered the basic law of being.

And where there are big conglomerates (armies, unions, coalitions, etc.) - there, alas, there are big wars.

By introducing the category of "Great War" into the equation, Igor Shumeiko not only translates the Second World War (and ours, the Great Patriotic War) from the language of the current millennium

377

(with current bills for the occupation and other inconveniences of wartime) into the language of wartime. In fact, he offers a new starting point - one that was not in the schemes of 1941

of the year.

The world war was then deduced from the theories of imperialism, colonialism, from certain "stages" of this or that "system", from the readiness of communism to finally bury capitalism with its wars ... It was not for nothing that the Soviet people rose in 1941 to fight Hitlerism, being sure that the war is the last.

Tell them then that there will be no "last" ...

To say something equally hopeless to their fathers, who sang: "This is our last..."

But now you have to say "something the same." Andersen's baby voice. Almost at random, by touch, blindly, almost with despair, recognizing that there is something in the very foundation of being, under all political correctness and political aggressiveness - somewhere where Tyutchev heard the stir of chaos - something something that at any unexpected moment can, like fire, a storm, or horror, break out onto the surface of historical action, overturning all restraints at once.

The "Great War" is something that dictates its own rules. Or no rules. Something that lives according to its own laws. And killing. Something that cannot be commanded, for the War itself commands everything. This is not a "sequel"

politics by other means" is the annulment of all previous politics. This does not fit into the concepts of justice and injustice. It fits only

into Tolstoy's dilemma: war is either absurd or popular. That is, a nailing club. But even a club from the point of view of peaceful logic is a fair amount of absurdity.

Realizing what kind of monster he is letting into the wilds and labyrinths of History, Igor Shumeiko warns that "The Great War" is the "main term" of his book, that this concept was introduced "semi-intuitively", and the only thing that can be done with giant dumps "indigestible" facts is to try to reload them into a new coordinate system.

This RELOAD, of course, requires, in addition to knowledge of "indigestible" facts (which I have already noted in Shumeiko), a desperate (and purely artistic) imagination. Much more impressive than pamphlet shine.

378

Therefore, in conclusion, I want to recall a fragment from the book by Igor Shumeiko, where he presents the consequences of the Munich "appeasement" of Hitler in the form of ... a beer metaphor. The very one where the "comrade" twists the big man, the pan and monsieur, who has already got rich with money and weapons, and then begins to justify himself, "muttering about socialism ...".

I will comment on the picture (quite, however, clear).

Who is this hardened and embittered comrade, mumbling something "about socialism", we understand. And who the pan is is also clear: this is a Czech, whose country Hitler was smashing is about to slash and capture. And who monsieur is understandable.

Where, excuse me, my lord? He was also sitting there! Where did he go with the purse and the revolver? After all, in Munich, not only Daladier decided the fate of Europe, but also Chamberlain, who believed that by giving Hitler Czechoslovakia, he was buying peace for Europe.

Chamberlain thought something else, but only Churchill thought otherwise. The "Great War", already hanging in the air, canceled all the previous rules of the game, and it was Churchill who felt this. It was he, the fierce enemy of the Soviet Union before the war (and immediately after the war, too, starting with the Fulton speech), who in 1940 declared to Hitler the same war to the death that Hitler declared to Stalin in 1941.

Interesting geography: of all the major European nations, only the British immediately decided on a "Great War" without rules, and that is why, without waiting for Petain to hand over the fleet to the Germans, the British began to sink this French fleet. Yes, it was the same violation of the rules (and purely human meanness) as the seizure of the Baltic States by the Red Army. What was to be done? The British needed for the war a sea free from the Germans, and for the war we needed a coast free from the Germans. That is, the territory of the Baltic states. We should have delayed the deadly fight, moved as far as possible the future front line.

And without the Latvian sour cream and without the Estonian slates, we would somehow manage. Now we get along quite well.

Returning to the current sovereign accounts (to the rules of normal life, that is, to relations free from military expediency = human meanness), I will say this. From the Soviet government, the Balts still received the status

379

union republics (which was used when separating from the disintegrating Union). And what they would have received from the Germans if they had been part of the Third Reich during the Great War is a big subjunctive question. I'm afraid Igor Shumeiko is right when he assumes that for Messrs. Rosenberg and Ribbentrop all this "hoarding" was not the "only Europe" that for us (Peter cut a window there for us, and the Soviet Union inherited), but hereditary noah, from Baltic times, a servant under the German barons.

Therefore, in Shumeykov's beer-bar-picture, the same "spectator-Balt" is quite legitimate, who sits on the sidelines on his chair, hoping to wait out the fight, and is very offended when a friend pulls this sovereign chair out from under him to crack him on the head herra aggressor.

It remains for me to comment on the last stroke in the picture.

"For some reason, there is no way out of this strange bar."

This is in the situation of 1938 - no. And half a century later? What happened there half a century later? The results of the "Great War" came to Helsinki to freeze... And then a blaze broke out in Afghanistan, on the other side of the Earth from Helsinki.

The Europeans, who washed themselves with blood in two world wars, stood up on their ears to prevent a new battle of monsters on their continent. If such a horror had happened for the third time, the strategic map of 1914 (aka the map of 1941) would again stretch from Vichy to the Volga, to the Caucasus, to the Urals.

And what if from the other side - because of the Volga, the Urals and the Caucasus - such a force tramples down that it will generally change the contours of future history? In addition to Hitler and Napoleon, Attila, Genghis, and Timur walked around here... What strategic cards will then have to be laid out on the table, what paint to cover it all with, what demons to drive back into the bottles?

Who will drive?

Like who? The current one-year-old babies who, having grown up, will see all these devils.

Lev Anninsky

TABLE OF CONTENTS

L.G. Ivashov. Foreword nii ilyanini, 5 From the author. From the Diplomatic Preface to the second edition of World War II. Reboot". June, 2007 llnniInnini 8 Part one "WWII - THIRD RELOAD" yen lines

Head |. The origin of the main theme of the book and some

manager ii iniiiiinniniya 11 Chapter 2. Adolf Hitler as a trust to external causes

CJSC "Europe" ini linesiiiiiiiiinnnnnnnnnn, 13 Chapter 3. On the "right of waging a "Great War"

those who turned up under the arm23 Chapter 4. "The Last Argument of Kings" and about
izilnninininninie 29 Chapter 5. Terminological crisis

.....lineiiiiiiiiinne 44 Chapter 6. The direction of the main blow - von Clausewitz ... 49 Chapter 7. Disputes of historians with Rezun no nynyiniiiii: 59 Chapter 8. "Too Much Churchill!"oriniiiiinininee 76 Chapter 9. New Top Managers

"United Europe" and iiiinininininnnr105 Chapter 10.

property" (and a little about public

order during the period of transmission)eneninne, 123 Chapter |1. The main "Munichs" of Czech history 129 Chapter 12. And how many columns were there? nii 144 Chapter 13. Was it easy for the neutrals? ini 154 Chapter 14. About the measurement of resistances +. 166 Chapter 15. And where was the nobleman then?

(Baltic abacus) and liiiiiiiiinninini:174 Chapter 16. Six feathers from each goose of the kingdom

(War and Justice)eeeeeeiniiiii: 189

381

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter Chapter

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter

Chapter Chapter

Chapter Chapter

Chapter

17. Russia - Germany (Facts and theories, conversations and personal experience)

18. The fight against the godless Hitler.

== .

I C>

10.

And eternal pop

, Part two "WAR AND WORLD... AND WAR"

Fulton. Declaration of Warlllyninny

"An equation with an unknown number of unknowns" About Russian wars, instincts, rulers,

yin or nii

"Rus-garten" (about the "cordon sanitaire", "Euro-orderlies" and one stubbornly surviving

"patient") lil

GeBenzgait and the Magna Carta (Energy) "Race of Consumption" Problems of the Republic of Kazakhstan of the Department of the Corporation "Russian Federation" Generals of the Russian glossy Geopolitical Darts. Darts of "Local conflicts" in two hemispheres

cold war?

Application. Geopolitics and all that...

(History of World War II -

in fifty text messages) lllllllllinnini

Afterword. Lev Anninsky. WAIT

BABY, DAMN?

ooo ooo vo vo fo ooo ooo ooo ot vo ooo

Igor Shumeiko HITLER'S EUROPE AGAINST THE USSR

The unknown history of World War II

Published in the author's edition

Art editor /1. Volkov Technical editor V. Kulagina Computer proofing A. Popov Proofreader N. Struenze

LLC "Yauza-press" 109439, Moscow, Volgogradsky prospect, 120, bldg. 2.

For correspondence: 127299, Moscow, st. Clara Zetkin, 18/5 Tel.: (495) 745-58-23

Signed for publication on 01.10.2009. Format 84x108/16. Headset "Literary". Offset printing. Boom. type. Conv. oven I. 20.16. Circulation 4000 copies. Zach. No. 19077.

Printed using C1P technology at OAO Printing Yard named after V.I. A. M. Gorky. 197110, St. Petersburg, Chkalovsky pr., 15.

HITLER'S EUROPE AGAINST THE USSR

, In the NEW "cold war" unleashed by the West against Russia, history becomes the main weapon - reviewing the results of the Second World War, the revisionists are increasingly aggressively demanding that we "begone" for the Soviet past: they want to make us "pay and repent." But we are not in

What to repent and nothing to pay for. Naobo

mouth - we ourselves are able to present Europe with a large bill.

Because long before 1968, when Soviet tanks entered Czechoslovakia, Czech Wehrmacht tanks were killing our grandfathers near Moscow and Stalingrad. Because the Latvian shooters

unleashed the genocide of the Russian people two decades before the Red Army "Sovietized" the Baltic states. Because twenty years before Katyn, the Poles killed tens of thousands of captured Red Army soldiers in their concentration camps. Because during the years of the Second World War in Europe "occupied" (or rather, united) by Hitler, there were far fewer Resistance fighters than SS volunteers, not to mention the tens of millions that voluntarily worked for the military industry of the Reich.

Read about all this, about the most shameful and dirty secrets of the "united Europe" in the sensational book by Igor Shumeiko.

15VM 978-5-9955-0094-0

917

85995150094 01>